Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, Monograph No. I.

BUDDHAGHOSA

By BIMALA CHURN LAW

M A, B L, PH D., D LITT

Fellow, Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Hony Correspondent, Archaeological Survey of India, Hon Member, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute; Author, *Tribes in Ancient India, India as described in early texts of Buddhism and Jainism, Aśvaghoṣa, Concepts of Buddhism, Geography of Early Buddhism, Geographical Essays, Srāvastī in Indian Literature, Rājagṛiha in Ancient Literature, Kauśāmbī in Ancient Literature, Pañchālas and their capital, Ahicchatra, Historical Gleanings, The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa, A History of Pali Literature, etc, etc.*

PUBLISHED BY THE BOMBAY BRANCH ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY,
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY

1946

PREFACE

The present treatise is a revised edition of my *Life and Work of Buddhaghosa* published in 1923. An attempt has been made here to give a systematic history of the life and labours of the most celebrated commentator of the Theravāda School of Buddhism. Born in India Buddhaghosa was brought up in the Brahmanic traditions. He had a good knowledge of Indian literature. He was conversant with the grammatical system of Pāṇini and was apparently a follower of the system of Patañjali before he embraced the Buddhist faith. Not only the Yoga but Sāṅkhya system was also known to him. He thoroughly studied the Abhidhamma literature from which he drew a good deal of his materials. He studied Buddhism thoroughly and he dealt with the subject carefully. He enriched Buddhist literature by drawing new materials from other sources. He ably studied the literature of Ceylon and was one of the greatest celebrities of the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura. He was undoubtedly a great writer and an exponent of Buddhism. Mahāyāna Buddhism was known to him as *Vedallavāda* or *Vetullavāda* and he was acquainted with its main philosophy as the doctrine of the great void (*Mahāsuññatāvāda*). Mrs. Rhys Davids is perfectly right in saying that Buddhaghosa apparently resembled the European philosophers prior to Hume and Hartley so far as the problems of representative cognition or of the association of ideas are concerned. As long as Buddhism remains a living faith among mankind Buddhaghosa will not cease to be remembered with reverence and gratitude. His was a useful career. He lived long to see his labours rewarded and to enjoy the wide fame he so well-deserved.

In the first chapter I have dealt with the life of the great commentator along with the legends connected with it. In the second chapter I have given his personal history. In it his age, his early life and education, his career in South India and Ceylon, his reminiscences of Ceylon—all these problems have been discussed. The third chapter deals with his predecessors such as the *Porāṇas, Bhāṇakas, Aṭṭhakathācariyas, Nāgasena* and *Mahākaccāna*. The difficult problem of the commentary process within the Canon has not also escaped my attention. The fourth chapter treats of his successors. The most noteworthy of them are *Buddhadatta, Culla-Buddhaghosa, Buddhaghosa III* and *Dhammapāla*. In this

chapter I have discussed the vexed problem of the authorship of the Jātaka commentary. The fifth chapter gives an account of his works. The sixth chapter deals with his textual and doctrinal expositions. The seventh and the last chapter treats of his philosophy.

It is not an easy task to construct a connected biography of Buddhaghosa. I have tried to utilize all his works as well as the documents from which any information regarding him can be gathered. I shall consider myself amply rewarded if the present monograph serves to convince our readers that Buddhaghosa was a notable person who lived and worked for the propagation of the Buddhist faith and for the interpretation of Buddhist literature.

I am thankful to the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay Branch, for accepting it as their monograph.

Calcutta,
43 Kailas Bose Street,
January, 1946.

BIMALA CHURN LAW.

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhidhammāvatāra (Ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, P.T.S.).
Aṅguttara Nikāya (Ed. R. Morris and E. Hardy, P.T.S.).
Apadāna (Ed. Mary E. Lilley, P.T.S.).
Atthasālinī (Ed. E. Muller, P.T.S. and Devanāgarī Ed. by Bapat and Vadekar, Bhandarkar Oriental Series).

Barhut (B. M. Barua).
Barhut Inscriptions (Barua and Sinha).
Buddhacarita of Aśvaghoṣa (Eds. Cowell and Johnston).
Buddhadatta's Manuals (A. P. Buddhadatta, P.T.S.).
Buddhaghosa's Parables (Capt. T. Rogers).
Buddhaghosuppatti (Ed. James Gray).
Buddhavamsa and Cariyāpiṭaka (Ed. R. Morris, P.T.S.).
Buddhism as a religion (Hackmann).
Buddhist Birth Stories (Mrs. Rhys Davids).
Buddhist India (T. W. Rhys Davids).
Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics, A (Mrs. Rhys Davids).
Buddhist Psychology (Mrs. Rhys Davids, Quest Series).
Buddhist Records of the Western World (Beal).
Buddhistic Studies (Ed. B. C. Law).

Cariyāpiṭaka Commentary (Ed. D. L. Barua, P.T.S.).
Ceylon Lectures (B M. Barua).
Compendium of Buddhist Philosophy (Shwe Zan Aung, P.T.S.).
Cūlavamsa (Ed. Geiger, P.T.S.).

Debates Commentary, The (B C. Law, P.T.S).
Dhammapada (New Edition by Suriyagoḍa Sumangala Thera, P.T.S.).
Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā (Ed. H. C. Norman, P.T.S.).
Dhammasaṅgaṇi (Ed. E Müller, P T S.).
Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names (Malalasekera).
Dīgha Nikāya (Ed T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, P.T.S.).
Dīpavamsa (Oldenberg).

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (Ed. Hastings).
Epigraphia Birmanica.
Etude sur les Jātakas (Léon Feer).

Gandhavaṃsa (J.P.T.S , 1886).
Grammar (Pāṇini).

Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective (B. C. Law).
Historical Gleanings (B. C. Law).
History of Pali Literature, A (B. C. Law).

Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIX, 1890 (April).
Indian Culture.
Itivuttaka (Ed. E. Windisch, P.T.S.).

Jagajjyotiḥ, Āṣāḍa, 1315 B.S , Pt. II.
Jātaka (Fausböll and Siamese Eds.).
Journal of the Pali Text Society, 1886, 1889, 1890, 1905, 1906-7 and 1910–12.

Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī (MS.).
Kathāvatthu (Ed. Arnold C. Taylor, P.T.S.).
Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā (J.P.T.S., 1889).
Khuddakapāṭha (Ed. Helmer Smith, P.T.S.).

Life and Work of Buddhaghosa (B. C. Law).

Life or Legend of Gaudama (Bishop Bigandet).

Mahāvaṃsa (Ed. Geiger, P.T.S. and Turnour).
Mahāvastu (Ed Senart).
Majjhima Nikāya (Ed Trenckner and Chalmers, P.T.S.).
Manorathapūraṇī (Ed. Max Walleser and H. Kopp, P.T.S.).
Manual of Buddhism, A (Spence Hardy).
Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions, A (B. C. Law)
Manual of Indian Buddhism (Kern).
Milinda-Pañho (Ed. Trenckner, R.A.S.).

Nettipakaraṇa (Ed E Hardy, P.T.S.)
Niddesa (Ed. La Vallée Poussin, E. J. Thomas and W. Stede, P.T.S.).

Padyacūḍāmaṇi (Ed Ranga Acharya and Kuppuswami Śāstrī, published by the Madras Government).
Pali Literature of Burma (Mabel Bode).
Pali Reader, A (Anderson).
Papañcasūdanī (Ed J. H. Woods, D. Kosambi and I B. Horner, P T S.).
Paramatthadīpanī on the Peta and Vimānavatthus (Ed. E Hardy, P T.S).
Paramatthajotikā on the Khuddakapāṭha (Ed. Helmer Smith, P T S.).
Paramatthajotikā on the Sutta Nipāta (Ed. Helmer Smith, P T S)
Path of Purity (Pe Maung Tin, P.T S)
Paṭisambhidāmagga (Arnold C Taylor, P T S.).
Paṭṭhānappakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā (Ed Mrs. Rhys Davids, J.P.T.S , 1886).
Psalms of the Brethren (Mrs. Rhys Davids, P T S)
Psalms of the Sisters (Mrs. Rhys Davids, P T.S)
Puggalapaññatti (Ed R Morris, P T S)
Puggalapaññatti-aṭṭhakathā (Ed Georg Landsberg and Mrs Rhys Davids, P.T S.).

Questions of King Milinda, The (T. W Rhys Davids, S B E)

Rasavāhinī (Sinhalese Ed.).

Saddhammasaṅgaha (J.P.T.S , 1890).
Samantapāsādikā (Ed J Takakusu and M Nagai, P T S).
Sammohavinodanī (Ed. A. P Buddhadatta Thero, P T S , Siamese Ed)
Saṃyutta Nikāya (Ed Léon Feer, P.T S)
Saṅgītiparyāya Sūtra (Tibetan and Chinese translations).
Sāratthappakāsinī (Ed. F. L. Woodward, P T S)
Sāsanavaṃsa (Ed. M. Bode, P T S)
Saundarananda Kāvya of Aśvaghoṣa (Eds. H P. Shāstrī and Johnston)
Śiśupālabadha
Skanda Purāṇa (Vaṅgavāsī Ed).
Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India (B. C. Law)
Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (Ed. T W. Rhys Davids, J Estlin Carpenter and W Stede P T.S.)

Thera-Therī-Gāthā (Ed. H Oldenberg and R. Pischel, P.T S.).

Udāna (Ed. Paul Steinthal, P T.S.).
University of Ceylon Review.

Vaṃsatthappakāsinī (Mahāvaṃsa-ṭīkā, Ed. Malalasekera, P T.S.)
Vibhaṅga (Ed. Mrs Rhys Davids, P T S).
Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga (P. V Bapat)
Vinaya Piṭaka (Ed. Oldenberg, P.T S.).
Visuddhimagga (Mrs. Rhys Davids, P.T.S.)

Yamaka-aṭṭhakathā (Ed. Mrs. Rhys Davids, J.P.T.S., 1910–12)
Yoga-sūtra (Patañjali).

Chapter I

LIFE AND LEGENDS

The name of Buddhaghosa stands out as that of the greatest known Pali commentator and exegetist. He did for the Pāli Tripiṭaka what Sāyaṇa did for Vedic literature or Sīlāṅka for the Jaina Āgama. The materials for his life-history in the modern sense of a biography are yet scanty. The legendary accounts of later growth lack any real historical foundation. The traditional account of his life, career, attainments and achievements, which is contained in the continuation of Mahānāma's Great Chronicle, *Mahāvaṃsa*, is interesting as it appears to embody some genuine information about certain details on the basis of which Buddhaghosa's biography may be constructed in the light of modern research. It was conventional with the Pāli commentators to state the circumstances in which they undertook to write a particular work either in the verses forming the Prologue, or in those forming the *Nigamana* or Epilogue, or in both. In this respect Buddhadatta, another Pali scholiast, surpasses others of his trade, for he alone discloses a biographical outline of his own life in the *Nigamanas* appended to all his works. The facts stated by Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla are just those which were relevant to a particular commentary or treatise written by them. Thus the information supplied is obviously suited to the history of the work itself rather than to that of its author. Accordingly they left behind them no other records of themselves than their writings to be appraised for what they are worth. This is precisely the fate which the great sons of India themselves sincerely desired. It is comforting to think that what they have omitted to give us is but the external details of their personal domestic life, and what they have left us is the spiritual legacy of their thought, the abiding record of their inner life and experience. And yet while reading through their works, we feel an intense desire to know something about the persons themselves, to live over again with them the life they actually lived, to see the things they actually saw, and, above all, to prepare ourselves by their examples to fight the great battle of life and to cope with its deeper problems. These are the feelings that come irresistibly.

If Buddhaghosa has left for us nothing except his writings, to make a close and careful study of them and to separate the

few grains of biographical detail from a mass of extraneous matter is a Herculean task; the traditions and legends preserved are so meagre and so much coloured by the afterthoughts of the later ages of credulity that it seems at first sight to be an impossible task to obtain any reliable information from them. And yet in the last resort these works of his with certain personal references in them and late traditions and legends are the only materials on which an authentic account of his life-history has to be attempted.

The Venerable Dhammatilaka in his Siamese edition of the *Visuddhimagga* in three parts, has appended a life of Buddhaghosa at the end of Part III, which, as he tells us, is based upon the *Saddhammasaṅgaha*[1] and the *Mahāvaṃsa*. For the details of the life, he refers us to the *Buddhaghosanidāna*, meaning evidently the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, the *Vaṃsamālinī*, and particularly the *Ñāṇodaya* (*Ñāṇodaye visese pi*).[2] One may readily agree with Barua in identifying the *Mahāvaṃsa* referred to by Dhammatilaka with the continuation of Mahānāma's *Great Chronicle* in Geiger's *Cūḷavaṃsa*, and the *Buddhaghosa-nidāna* with the *Buddhaghosuppatti* edited and translated by James Gray, and now edited in Devanāgarī characters by Professor N. K. Bhagwat. His identification of the *Vaṃsamālinī* with the *Mahāvaṃsaṭīkā* still awaits confirmation.[3] It would be highly interesting if Siam preserves a text of the *Ñāṇodaya* which is known in the *Cūḷavaṃsa* tradition as one of the earlier writings of Buddhaghosa before he was sent across to Ceylon.

The account of Buddhaghosa as given in the supplement to the *Mahāvaṃsa* is in the main worthy of credence as we shall see anon. In course of time, however, a mass of legends grew about the few simple facts noted by Dhammakitti. Such legends are found in the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, also known as the *Mahābuddhaghosassa Nidānavatthu*, by the Thera Mahāmaṅgala about whose life and date we know hardly anything. He was most probably a Ceylonese by birth as pointed out by Gray,[4] and evidently lived after the time when the *Cūḷavaṃsa* account was written. Besides the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, other late Pali works such as the *Gandhavaṃsa*[5] the *Sāsanavaṃsa*,[6] and the *Saddhammasaṅgaha*,[7] furnish

---

[1] Published in *J.P.T.S.*, 1890, pp. 21ff. B. C. Law has translated this work into English and the University of Calcutta has published it—*A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions*, 1941.

[2] *Visuddhimagga*, Siamese Ed., III, p. 386

[3] Barua, *Ceylon Lectures*, pp 90f.

[4] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p 33.

[5] *J P.T S*, 1886, p. 66.

[6] *P T.S.*, 1897, edited by Miss Bode.

[7] *J P T S.*, 1890, p. 55; B. C. Law, *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions.*

some additional details. But the accounts of all these works are of the nature of legends in which fact and fiction are often hopelessly blended together. The authors have given free scope to their imagination and introduced poetical and rhetorical embellishments, rendering it difficult to dissociate the grains of authentic biography from the chaff of fable and fiction that has accumulated round the name of the great scholar. J. Gray has brought together the account of the life of Buddhaghosa from these and other sources, Talaing, Sinhalese, and Burmese. We give below a summary of the story of Buddhaghosa derived mainly from the materials collected by Gray, basing it mainly upon the *Buddhaghosuppatti*.

After the death of Thera Mahinda there appeared, in course of time, a thera named Buddhaghosa.[1] There was a village named Ghosa not far from the great Bo-tree; this village was called Ghosagāma, as it was inhabited by a large number of cowherds. A certain king[2] ruled at that time and he had a Brahmin chaplain (*purohita*) named Kesī who was the foremost among the preceptors of his time. Kesī had a wife named Kesiṇī.[3] At that time it was found very difficult to understand the teachings of the Lord as they were written in Sinhalese. A certain thera who possessed supernatural powers and was free from sins, thought thus: 'Who is that great thera who will be able to render the teachings of the Lord into the Māgadhī language from the language of Ceylon?' Thinking thus he saw clairvoyantly that there lived a celestial being in the Tāvatiṃsa heaven, who would be competent to perform the task. Thereupon the thera appeared before Sakka who asked him as to the cause of his coming. He informed Sakka about his mission. Sakka asked him to wait a little. The chief of the Tāvatiṃsa devas then approached a deva named Ghosa and enquired, 'Do you wish to go to the human world?' The deva replied: 'I desire to

[1] According to the Burmese tradition, Buddhaghosa was born in Northern India in the fifth century A D in the country of Magadha. (Cf *Buddhism as a religion* by Hackmann, p 68.)

[2] King Saṅgrāma who ruled in Magadha at the beginning of the fifth century A.D. Kesi was his spiritual adviser (*Jagajjyotih*, Āṣāḍa, 1315, B.S., Pt. II)

[3] It is recorded in the *Sāsanavaṃsa* that Buddhaghosa was a native of Ghosagāma near the Bodhi terrace. The Brahmin Kesa was his father and Kesī his mother (p. 29).

'*Mahātherā ... Ghosaṃ .. yācitvā bodhirukkhasamīpe Ghosagāme Kesassa nāma brāhmanassa Kesiyā nāma brāhmaniyā kucchimhi paṭisandhim ganhāpesuṃ.*' The *Sāsanavaṃsa* (p. 30) further narrates that Thera Buddhaghosa was born in a Brahmin village near the great Bo-tree. ('*Buddhaghosathero nāma mahābodhirukkhasamīpe ekasmiṃ brāhmanagāme vijāto.*')

go to a still higher celestial world and not to the human world where there is much suffering; but if the teaching of the Lord is difficult for the human beings to understand, I am ready to go there.' Thus he consented and his consent was made known to the thera who was a friend of the Brahmin Kesī. The thera next went and told Kesī, 'During seven days from this day, don't plunge into worldly enjoyments; a son will be born to you who will be very wise and virtuous.' Saying this the thera left him. Exactly on the seventh day, the deva Ghosa, after death, was reborn in the womb of Kesinī. After ten months he was born, and to him as a babe, slaves, hired servants, and Brahmins uttered sweet words, 'eat, drink'. The boy is said to have been named Ghosa on account of these utterances.[1] When Ghosa was seven years old, he learnt the Vedas and within seven years, he acquired mastery over the three Vedas.[2] One day he was eating peas sitting on the shoulder of Viṣṇu. Seeing him thus seated, the other Brahmins grew angry and said: 'Why are you eating peas sitting on the shoulder of our teacher Viṣṇu? You do not know your own measure, how will you know the three Vedas?' Ghosa replied: 'The Māsa (pea) itself is Viṣṇu; what is it that is called Viṣṇu?—of these two, how can I know which is Viṣṇu?' The Brahmins could not give any reply, they merely looked at one another. They were struck dumb, and informed Kesī all about it. Kesī asked his son, 'Have you behaved like this?' Ghosa replied in the affirmative. Thereupon Kesī consoled the Brahmins thus: 'Don't be angry, he is young.' The Brahmins went away thus consoled.[3]

Kesī used to instruct the king in the Vedas. One day he went to the king, accompanied by his son. While instructing his royal pupil, he came on a passage in which some knotty points were involved. He could not make out their meaning, and with the king's permission, returned home. Ghosa being aware of it, secretly wrote the meaning of those difficult points in the book for the benefit of his father. The Brahmin Kesī became highly satisfied when he saw the purport and meaning of the points which had puzzled him, written down in the book, and enquired who had actually done it. He was informed by the members of his family that his son was the writer. Thereupon the Brahmin asked

---

[1] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p. 39. Cf. *Sāsanavamsa*, p. 29. '*Khādatha bhonto pivatha bhonto ti ādi brāhmanānam aññamaññaṃ ghosakāle vijāyanattā Ghosoti nāmam akāsi*'

[2] Cf. *Sāsanavamsa*, p. 29. '*Sattavassikakāle so tinnam vedānam pāragū ahosi.*'

[3] *Buddhaghosuppatti* (Ed. by J Gray), pp. 37–40.

his son, 'Dear, is this writing yours?' The boy replied in the affirmative. Kesī lost no time in informing the king of it. The latter greatly delighted, embraced the young Ghosa, kissed his forehead, saying: 'You are my son, I am your father', and rewarded him with an excellent village.[1]

Ghosa learnt the Vedas and he got by heart six thousand *padas* daily. One day a great thera, who was a friend of Kesī, went to the latter's house to take his food. Ghosa's seat was allotted to him and the thera being indifferent as to whose seat it was, sat on it. Ghosa became angry, seeing the great thera seated on his seat, and he abused the latter thus: 'This shaven-headed Samaṇa is shameless; he does not know his measure. Why has my father invited him? He does not know the Vedas or another cult.' He resolved to ask him questions regarding the Veda as soon as he finished his meal. Accordingly he asked the thera: 'Do you know the Veda or any other cult?' Mahāthera being greatly pleased said: 'Oh, Ghosa, I know your Vedas or any other cult.' Ghosa said: 'If you know the Vedas, please recite.' Then the Mahāthera recited the three Vedas, fully bringing out the significance of the knotty points. Ghosa was charmed by his recitation and said thus: 'I want to know your cult, please recite.' The Mahāthera then recited the contents of the *Abhidhamma* with special reference to *kusala dhamma, akusala dhamma* and *abyākata dhamma*. He also explained some difficult problems of Buddhist philosophy which were afterwards incorporated in the *Atthasālinī*, a commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*. Altogether twenty-one kinds of *kusala dhamma*, twelve kinds of *akusala dhamma*, thirty-six kinds of *vipāka* (consequence) and twenty kinds of *kiriyācitta* were mentioned by the Mahāthera. While listening to the exposition of *saddhamma* (good law), Ghosa was utterly charmed and said: 'What is your cult? Can a householder learn it?' He was told that it could be learnt by a monk. Ghosa said: 'The cult of the Buddha is invaluable, it pleases me; when one has learnt it, he becomes free from all suffering.' He then informed his parents that he intended to renounce the world. He said, 'I shall take ordination from the Mahāthera, learn the cult of the Buddha and then I shall come back home being disrobed.' His parents consented after some hesitation and took him to the Mahāthera and spoke to him thus, 'This is your grandson, who is desirous of receiving ordination from you, give him ordination.' Ghosa was ordained and

[1] *Buddhaghosuppatti* (Ed. by J. Gray), pp. 40-41.

was given *Tacakammaṭṭhāna.*[1] On asking the meaning of *Tacakammaṭṭhāna,* he received the following reply, 'Meditate upon kesa, loma, nakha, danta, and taca.' All Buddhas realized the fruition of saintship depending on *Tacakammaṭṭhāna.*[2] Ghosa listened to it, meditated thereon and became established in the Three Refuges. He practised the ten precepts, having acquired a firm faith in the teaching of the Lord. He told the thera, 'Sir, the teaching of the Lord puts an end to suffering; my Vedas are worthless and they are rightly given up by the Buddha and other saints.'[3] Thus he obtained ordination from the hands of the Mahāthera. The name of the Buddhist Elder is not mentioned in the second chapter of the *Buddhaghosuppatti* where the details of Ghosa's conversion have been noted. According to the *Saddhammasaṅgaha,*[4] it was one Revata who gave him ordination after he had embraced Buddhism. It is stated there that a young Brahmin wandered through villages, countries, towns, and capital cities of Jambudvīpa and defeated everybody by answering questions put to him. At last he came to a monastery; there many hundreds of the Order dwelt; of these the Thera Revata was the foremost, who was free from sin, who had acquired analytical knowledge and who used to defeat other disputants. The young Brahmin was one day chanting the *mantras* and the thera listened to the recitation and said, 'Who is this braying like an ass?' The youth replied, 'Oh, monk! how will you know the meaning involved in the braying of an ass?' The thera said, 'Yes, I know'. He was thereupon asked questions regarding all knotty points involved in the three Vedas, the *Itihāsas,* etc. The thera answered them correctly. At last the thera said to his young interlocutor, 'Oh, Brahmin, you have asked me many questions, I ask you only one, please answer it.' The young man replied, 'Ask me any question, I am ready to answer.'

[1] ... *tti*, pp 42–45.

[2] *Kammaṭṭhāna* means analytical meditation or contemplation Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga* has enumerated forty *Kammaṭṭhānas*. *Tacakammaṭṭhāna* means meditation on hair, nails, teeth and skin.

[3] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, Tr. p. 11

[4] Pp. 51-52 (*J P T S*, 1890) '*Bho brāhmana, aham tayā bahu-pucchito, aham idāni tam ekam pañham pucchāmi, vyākarissasi me pañham ti Āma bho pabbajita puccha vyākarissāmīti Thero cittayamake imam pañhaṃ pucchi· Yassa cittam uppajjati, na nirujjhati tassa cittam nirujjhissati nuppajjhissati, yassa vā pana cittam nirujjhissati, nuppajjhissati tassa cittaṃ uppajjissati na nirujjhissatīti. Brāhmano uddham vā adho vā harituṃ asakkonto. Kinnāma bho pabbajjita idan ti āha. Buddha-manto nāmāyam brāhmanāti. Sakkā pana taṃ bho mayham pi dātum ti. Sakkā brāhmana amhehi gahitapabbajjaṃ ganhantassa dātum ti. Tato brāhmano mantatthāya pabbajjaṃ yāci Thero brāhmanam pabbājetwā upasampādesi.*'

The thera put a question to him from the *Cittayamaka* in the book of the *Yamaka*. The Brahmin was unable to answer it, and asked for ordination from him for the sake of the *mantra*. The thera ordained him and accepted him as a novice.

Here is another interesting incident of his life. One day Ghosa who was in a solitary place, thought, 'Is my knowledge greater or that of my preceptor, so far as the teaching of the Lord is concerned?'[1] The preceptor, by thought-reading, knew of the question that had arisen in the mind of Ghosa and he said to him thus, 'If you think thus, it is unworthy of you.' Ghosa begged his pardon and repented saying, 'It is my sin, pardon me.' The preceptor replied, 'I will pardon you if you go to Ceylon and render the teaching of the Lord into the Māgadhī language from the language of Ceylon.'[2] Ghosa said, 'If you desire it, I also desire to go to the island of Ceylon, yet let me stay here till I remove the false belief of my father.'

When Ghosa returned to his father Kesī, the latter thought thus, 'My son will now be a householder.' Breaking his silence, he asked Ghosa whether he would be a householder now. Ghosa did not reply.[3] He was maturing plans for persuading his father to give up his false belief and become a follower of the Buddha.

It is interesting to mention here how Ghosa is represented as succeeding in this task. He went to his own dwelling-place and caused two inner rooms to be built, making a roof of brick and plastering it with mud and covering it with planks. In one of the two rooms, he fitted up two bolts both inside and outside; there he kept fire, pot, rice, water, milk, curd, ghee, etc. And shutting the door of the room by a mechanism, he caused his father to enter the room. Kesī said, 'Dear, I am your father, why are you behaving like this?' Ghosa replied, 'It is true that you are my father, but as you are a heretic and have no faith in the teaching of the Lord, I have inflicted such punishment upon you.' The father replied, 'I do not cherish false belief, open the door.' Ghosa said, 'If you do not, then speak of the virtues of the Lord in the words, '*Iti pi so Bhagavā*, etc.' (the orthodox formula of the faithful). He filled his father's mind with pious fear, saying, 'If you do not give up false belief, you will

---

[1] Cf. *Sāsanavamsa*, p. 29 '*Buddhabhāsite piṭakattaye mama vā paññā adhikā udāhu upajjhāyassa vā ti.*'

[2] Cf *Sāsanavamsa*, p 29. '. *tvam āvuso Sīhaladīpaṃ gantvā piṭakattayam Sīhalabhāsakkharena likhitaṃ Māgadhabhāsakkharena likhāhi evam sati aham khamissāmīti āha.*'

[3] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p. 46.

fall into hell after death.' Kesī spent three days there and on the fourth day, he recollected the virtues of the Lord told by his son and uttered the words, '*Iti pi so Bhagavā*, etc.' and acquired a spotless faith in the Three Refuges. He admitted that the Buddha was his *Satthā* (teacher). He was established in the fruition of the First Path. Ghosa now opened the door of the room, bathed his father with scented water and asked his pardon. Kesī praised the Lord in verses. Ghosa became greatly delighted in listening to the words of his father. Thus Kesī gave up the false belief which he cherished so long, through the exertions of his son.[1]

After having established his father in the fruition of the first stage of sanctification, Ghosa begged his pardon and returned to his preceptor. No sooner did he get permission from his preceptor to go to Ceylon than he directed his steps towards the shore together with some merchants and boarded a ship which sailed at once. On his way to Ceylon,[2] he met a thera named Buddhadatta who was then coming back to Jambudvīpa from Laṅkā.[3] Buddhaghosa safely reached Laṅkādvīpa. There he went to the Saṃgharāja Mahāthera, saluted him and sat on one side just behind the monks who were learning *Abhidhamma* and *Vinaya*.[4] One day the chief of the congregation, while instructing the monks, came upon a knotty point, the meaning and purport of which he could not make clear. He was struck dumb and went to his inner chamber and sat there thinking upon it. Ghosa knew all about it and wrote out on a blackboard the purport and meaning of the knotty point and when the chief of the congregation came out of his inner chamber, he looked at the writing. The Saṃgharājā enquired, 'Who has written this?' He was told by the hermits thus, 'It must have been written by the stranger monk.' The chief enquired, 'Where has he gone?' The hermits sought him out and showed him to the

[1] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, edited by J. Gray, pp 47-48. Cf. *Sāsanavamsa*, edited by M. Bode, p. 29. '*Buddhaghoso ca pitaram micchādiṭṭhibhāvato mocetvā* . '

[2] On his way to Ceylon, before he met Buddhadatta, he reached Nāgapaṭṭana. *Saddhammasamgaho*, *J P.T S*, 1890, p 53. '*Nāgapattanam sampāpuni*.' B. C. Law, *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions* (Calcutta University Pub), p 73

[3] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p 49.

[4] It is recorded in the *Sāsanavamsa* (edited by Mabel Bode, p. 31) that Buddhaghosa went to Ceylon and he entered the Mahavihāra at Anurādhapura. There having listened to the Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathā and Theravāda from Thera Samghapāla, he said that he would prepare an aṭṭhakathā himself.

'*Buddhaghosathero Sīhaladīpam gantvā Anurādhapure Mahāvihāram pavisitvā Samghapālatherassa santike saddhim Sīhalaṭṭhakathāya theravāde sutvā aṭṭhakatham karissāmīti ārocesi*

chief. The chief enquired whether it was written by him and getting a reply in the affirmative, said, 'The congregation of monks should be taught by you in the three Piṭakas.' Ghosa refused, saying, 'I have come here to translate the teachings of the Lord from Sinhalese into Māgadhī.' On hearing this, the chief became pleased and said, 'If you have come here to perform such a task, you make clear to us the significance of the following stanza uttered by the Buddha in reference to the three Piṭakas:—

'Who is that person who being wise and established in the precepts, and having cultured his thoughts and wisdom, being ardent and skilful, can unravel this knot?' Ghosa consented, saying, 'All right,' and returned to his abode. On the very day in the afternoon, he wrote out the *Visuddhimagga* very easily, beginning with *sīle patiṭṭhāya*, etc. After writing the *Visuddhimagga*, he fell asleep. Sakka, the chief of the gods, stole it. On awaking he could not find out his own composition and wrote out the *Visuddhimagga* again, as quickly as possible, by lamplight. After completing it he kept it on his head and again fell asleep. Sakka stole it for the second time. The thera awaking could not find it, he again wrote it as quickly as possible. After completing it, he fell asleep by tying it to the garment he wore. Sakka then left the two books already stolen by him, on his head.[1] In the morning Ghosa was delighted to see his books on his head. After ablution he showed the three books to the chief of the congregation of monks at Laṅkā.[2] It is interesting to note that in these three books, there were more than one million nine hundred and twenty-three thousand letters, particles and prefixes. The chief became astounded and asked him as to the reason of his writing out the same book three times. Ghosa told him the reason. Then the three books were recited.[3] It is to be noticed that the particles, prefixes and letters were the same and were put in the same places in all the three books.[4] The chief noticing this feature, became greatly pleased and gave the author permission to render the teaching of the Lord into Māgadhī from Sinhalese. The chief spoke highly of the merits of Ghosa. Since then he

---

[1] Cf *Saddhammasamgaha*, J P T S, 1890, p 53 '. *devatā dve potthake tassa adāsi*' B. C. Law, *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions*, p. 74

[2] Cf *Sāsanavamsa*, p 30.

[3] Cf *Saddhammasangaha*, J P T S, 1890, p 53 '..*bhikkhu-samgho tinipotthakāni ekato vācesi*' Cf B. C Law, *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions*, p. 75.

[4] Cf. *Saddhammasangaha*, J P T.S., 1890, pp 53-54. '*Ganthato vā akkharato vā padato vā vyañjanato vā atthato vā pubbāparavasena vā theravādādihi vā pālihi vā tisu potthakesu aññathattam nāma nāhosi*' Cf. *Ibid*, p. 75.

became famous as Buddhaghosa among the inhabitants of Ceylon.[1] He was called the chief of the human beings like the Buddha on earth.[2]

While in Ceylon, Buddhaghosa used to live on the *lower flat of a seven-storied building. There he was engaged* in translating the teachings of the Lord daily[3]; in the morning when he used to go out for alms, he would see palm-leaves which had fallen and taking them he would depart from the place to which he had come to beg. This was his practice while he was in Ceylon. One day a toddy-seller who was wise and experienced, saw his acts, scattered on the place of his begging unbroken palm-leaves and then hid himself. The thera when he had finished begging, carried them to his house. The toddy-seller followed him, saw him actually engaged in writing and was satisfied. One day he took a potful of food and presented it to the thera. The thera said to him, 'There lives a superior thera on the upper flat, please give it to him.' The toddy-seller went upstairs and when he met the thera on the upper flat, the latter said, 'Buddhaghosa who dwells on the lower flat is worthier than we, daily he translates the teachings of the Lord into Māgadhī, give it to him.' The toddy-seller, thereupon, returned to Buddhaghosa and offered the food to him. He accepted it and made six shares out of it and gave one share to each of the six theras.

Buddhaghosa's task of translating was finished in three months. Having observed the Pavāraṇā, he informed the chief of the congregation of the completion of his task. The Saṃgharājā praised him much and set fire to all the works written by Mahinda in Sinhalese; Buddhaghosa now asked the permission of the congregation to go home and see his parents. While he was going to embark, the Sinhalese monks spoke ill of him thus, 'We are of opinion that this thera knows the Tripiṭakas, but he does not know Sanskrit.' As soon as Buddhaghosa heard this, he at once addressed the chief of the congregation of Sinhalese monks thus, 'Revered Sir, to-morrow, on the Sabbath-day, I shall give an address in Sanskrit; let the four-fold assembly gather together in the yard of the great shrine.' Early in the morning, he in the midst of the congregation ascended the pulpit to display his

---

[1] Cf. *Saddhammasamgaha*, *J.P.T.S.*, 1890, pp. 52-53. '*Tatopaṭṭhāya so bhikkhu Buddhaghosatthero nāmāti loke pākaṭo ahosi.*'

[2] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p. 58.

[3] According to Spence Hardy, Buddhaghosa took up his residence in the secluded Ganthākāra Vihāra where he was occupied with the work of translating, according to the grammatical rule of the Māgadhī, which is the root of all languages, the whole of the Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathās into Pāli (*A Manual of Buddhism*, p. 531.)

knowledge of Sanskrit and uttered some stanzas in Sanskrit, the purport of which is as follows [1]:—

> 'Subsisting as a porter, a cowherd, a water-drawer, or by serving the learned, is excellent. I beg you to let me hold up my hands in adoration; let not the three worlds by the seven offences disgustingly besmear the conchshell-like religion of the adorable one, the son of Suddhodana—a religion worthy to be reverenced by the head; besmear yourselves with virtue that is like sandalwood; otherwise destroying yourselves, death is preferable.' [2]

Then he got down from his pulpit and saluted the congregation of monks. Since then the monks had no doubt as to his knowledge of Sanskrit.

The following event, which is said to have happened while Buddhaghosa was in Ceylon, is worthy of notice. One day two maid-servants of two Brahmins fell out with each other. When one of them was walking up the bank of a pond taking a jar of water, the other was coming down in a hurry with one empty jar which collided with that of the former. The maid-servant whose jar was broken, was angry and abused the other who also abused her. Buddhaghosa hearing this, thought thus, 'There is nobody here, these women abusing each other would surely speak to their masters about it and I might be cited as a witness.' The master of the maid-servant whose jar was broken, referred the matter to the tribunal; the king not being able to decide the case asked, 'Who is your witness?' One of the maids referred to Buddhaghosa who was introduced to the king as a stranger, who received the punishment of the Church. Appearing before the king, Buddhaghosa observed, 'The abusive language used by the maid-servants of the Brahmins has been heard by me. We, monks, take no notice of such things.' Saying this, he handed over a book in which he had recorded the abusive language. His Majesty decided the case relying on the written evidence of Buddhaghosa. The Brahmins spoke ill of Buddhaghosa saying, 'This discarded monk has come to trade, you should not see him.' The king, however, praised the latter by saying that he (Buddhaghosa) was a man of quick wisdom and enquired as to where he lived. He said, 'I have never seen before a Samaṇa like him who is religious, of quick intellect and greatly meditative.' [3]

---

[1] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p. 61.
[2] *Ibid*, tr., p. 30
[3] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, pp. 53-54.

On returning from Ceylon, our monk, first of all, went to his preceptor in the Jambudvīpa and informed him that he had written the *Pariyatti*. Paying his respect to his spiritual guide, he went home to his parents who gave him excellent food to take.[1]

Some are of opinion that after having completed his work in Ceylon, Buddhaghosa came to Burma to propagate the Buddhist faith.[2] The Burmese ascribe the new era in their religion to the time when the great exegete reached their country from Ceylon.[3] He is said to have brought over from that island to Burma, a copy of Kaccāyana's Pāli Grammar, which he translated into Burmese. He is credited with having written a commentary on it. It is not, however, mentioned by the great Pāli grammarian and lexicographer, Moggallāna (A.D. 1153–1186), nor by the Prākrit grammarians Hem Chandra and others and must apparently be placed amongst the supposititious works of Buddhaghosa.[4] A volume of Parables in Burmese language is also attributed to him.[5] The Burmese Code of Manu, too, is said to have been introduced into Burma from Ceylon by the same Buddhist scholar.[6] But the code itself is silent on this point. Professor Hackmann says, 'There is ground for doubting the statement that this man brought Buddhism to Burma. The chronicles of Ceylon to which we owe the information about Buddhaghosa, and which must have been well-informed on the subject, give no account of his journey to further India. Indeed one of the most important inscriptions in Burma, which was erected at the end of the fifth century A.D., at the instance of a king of Pegu, who was among the most devoted adherents of Buddhism, and which throws a backward glance over the history of Buddhism in Burma, makes no mention whatsoever of Buddhaghosa. The Burmese tradition which refers to him does so on account of his translations and writings having become fundamental in the country, probably also because his intellectual influence may have inaugurated a new epoch in Burmese Buddhism.'[7]

We are of opinion that although the chronicles of Ceylon and the inscriptions of the fifth century A.D., erected at Burma, are silent on this point, yet his works, e.g. the *Atthasālinī*, the *Visuddhimagga*, etc., were well known to the

---

[1] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p 63.
[2] Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p 125
[3] Spence Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p 532
[4] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol XIX, 1890 (April), p. 119
[5] *Ibid*, p 119.
[6] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol XIX, p 119.
[7] H. Hackmann, *Buddhism as a religion*, p. 68.

Burmans and held in high esteem by them from a very early time. Even now Buddhaghosa is so much adored and worshipped by the Burmans that he appears actually to have lived amongst them.

We are to record here the death of the great commentator as described in the *Buddhaghosuppatti*.[1] The exact time of his death was known to him and he thought thus, 'Death is of three kinds, *samuccheda*, *khaṇika* and *sammuti*. Of these, *samuccheda* is the death of one without taint, *khaṇika* is the momentary cessation of thought production, *sammuti* is the ordinary death of all living beings and of these am I to die the common death?' Even at the last moment of his life, he was in the habit of philosophizing. Bearing in mind the precepts to be observed, he expired and was reborn in the Tuṣita heaven. We do not know where he breathed his last.[2] His commentaries are silent on this point.

After his death, a funeral bed of sandal-wood was prepared by all gods and men, Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas, on which to burn his dead body. After his dead body had been cremated, Brahmins and other persons took the relics, buried them in sacred spots near the Bodhi tree and erected stūpas over them.[3]

A critical examination of the *Buddhaghosuppatti* does not assist us much in elucidating the history of Buddhaghosa. The author had little authentic knowledge at his command. He only collected the legends which centred round the remarkable man by the time when his work was written. Those legends are mostly valueless from the historical point of view. Gray truly observes that the work reads like an 'Arthurian Romance'. The accounts given by the *Buddhaghosuppatti* about the birth, early life, conversion, etc., of Buddhaghosa, bear a striking similarity with those of Milinda and Moggaliputta Tissa. In the interview which took place between Buddhaghosa and Buddhadatta, the latter is said to have told Buddhaghosa thus, 'I went before you to Ceylon to compile Buddha's word, I am old, have not long to live and shall not, therefore, be able to accomplish my purpose. You carry out the work satisfactorily.' In the sixth chapter of the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, it is stated that Buddhaghosa rendered the Buddhist scriptures into Māgadhī and in the seventh chapter, it is written that when after three months, he completed his task, the works of Mahendra (Mahinda) were piled up to a

---

[1] Pp. 65-66

[2] The inhabitants of Cambodia are of opinion that Buddhaghosa died in their country in a great monastery named Buddhaghosavihāra which is very old

[3] *Buddhaghosuppatti*, p. 66

height seven times that of a middle-sized elephant in a holy spot near the great shrine and burnt. It is evident that the author in the sixth chapter has made a mistake. Buddhaghosa translated the Sinhalese commentaries into Māgadhī and not the texts themselves. Had it been so, there would not have been any occasion for setting fire to the works of Mahendra. On the other hand, they would have been carefully preserved as the only reliable and authentic interpretations of the sacred texts. It has been distinctly stated in the *Cūḷavaṃsa* that the Pāli canonical texts only existed in Jambudvīpa and Buddhaghosa was sent to Ceylon to translate the Sinhalese commentaries into Māgadhī.

It is interesting to note that the incidents connected with the birth, early life, and conversion of Buddhaghosa fully resemble those connected with the birth, early life, and conversion of Nāgasena as recorded in *The Questions of King Milinda*. Before his birth, Nāgasena was a *deva* living in a happy world and consented to come down to earth only at the request of the *Arahats* to uphold the teachings of the Buddha. Buddhaghosa, according to the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, was also a *deva* living in the next world, and came down to earth at the request of Sakka to translate the Sinhalese scriptures into Pāli. Both Buddhaghosa and Nāgasena are said to have showed wonderful signs of intelligence in their boyhood. Both mastered the Vedas within a very short time. Both were converted at a very early age by *theras* who used to visit their houses. The incidents in the lives of both these celebrities after conversion are similar. After ordination Nāgasena thought one day that his teacher must be a fool, inasmuch as he instructed him first in the *Abhidhamma* to the exclusion of other teachings of the Buddha. His teacher who was an *Arahat*, immediately came to know what was passing in the mind of Nāgasena and rebuked him for entertaining such thoughts. Nāgasena apologized, but his teacher said, 'I will not forgive you until you go and defeat King Milinda who troubles the monks by asking questions from the heretic's point of view.' According to the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, Buddhaghosa, too, one day reflected, 'Am I or my preceptor more advanced in the Buddha's words.' His teacher knowing his mind, said, 'Buddhaghosa, your thoughts please me not; if you reflect thus, you will see that they are not becoming of a priest; beg my pardon.' Thereupon Buddhaghosa apologized, but his teacher said, 'I shall pardon you if you go to Ceylon and render the Buddha's scriptures into Pāli.'

The story of the conversion of Buddhaghosa also tallies with that of Moggaliputta Tissa as recorded in the *Mahāvaṃsa*,

Chapter V. There is one incident in this episode which is of special interest. Once Tissa was out while a thera paid his daily visit to his father's house. The men in the house not finding any other seat, offered him the seat of Tissa. Tissa came back and saw the thera sitting on his own seat. He became angry and spoke to him in an unfriendly way. Thereupon the thera asked him, 'Young man, dost thou know the *Mantra*?' Tissa asked the thera the same question. The thera replied, 'Yes, I know.' Then Tissa asked the thera to explain some knotty points in the Vedas. The thera expounded them and in the end, asked Tissa a question from the *Cittayamaka*. Tissa was bewildered and asked the thera, 'What *mantra* is that?' On the thera saying that it was *Buddha-mantra*, Tissa said, 'Impart it to me.' The thera said, 'I impart it only to one who wears our robe.' According to the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, one day a Brahmin in the house of Kesī, father of Buddhaghosa, offered Buddhaghosa's seat to a thera who was Kesī's friend. This made Buddhaghosa angry and when the thera finished his meal, he asked him, 'Bald-headed Sir, do you know the Vedas or are you acquainted with any other *mantra*?' The thera replied, 'I know not only the Vedas but also another *mantra*,' and then he rehearsed the three Vedas. Buddhaghosa then requested him to repeat his *mantra*. Thereupon the thera recited before him portions of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*. Then knowing from the thera that it was *Buddha-mantra* and desiring to have a knowledge of that, he had his head shaven with the permission of his parents and becamo a monk.

The first part of the *Cūḷavaṃsa* containing a traditional account of Buddhaghosa was added to the *Mahāvaṃsa* proper by Dhammakitti, a Ceylonese monk of the middle of the thirteenth century. The account though made after the lapse of more than eight hundred years since the time when he lived, is not altogether unworthy of credence and is very probably derived from older materials. Our only regret is that it tells us so little. We make, therefore, no apology for giving here the whole of the brief account furnished by Dhammakitti.

Dhammakitti, while giving an account of the reign of king Mahānāma who ruled in Ceylon in the early years of the fifth century A.D., narrates the following story about the life and labours of Buddhaghosa.[1] 'A Brahmin youth born in

[1] *Mahāvamsa* (Turnour), pp. 250–3, *Cūḷavamsa* (P T S.), I, *sattatiṃsatimo paricchedo* (37th chapter), vs. 215–46; cf Anderson's *Pāli Reader*, pp. 113-4;—

'*Bodhimaṇḍasamīpamhi jāto brāhmanamāṇavo,*
Vijjāsippakalāvedī tīsu vedesu pārago,

the neighbourhood of the terrace of the great Bo-tree (in Magadha), accomplished in the "*vijjā*", "*sippa*" and "*kalā*",

Sammāviññātasamayo sabbavādavisārado,
Vādatthī Jambudīpamhi āhiṇḍanto pavādino
Vihāram ekam āgamma rattim Pātañjali-matam
parivatteti sampunnapadam suparimaṇḍalam
Tatth'eko Revato nāma mahāthero vijāniya,
'Mahāpañño ayam satto, dametum vaṭṭatīti' so
'Ko nu gadrabharāvena viravanto'ti abravi,
'gadrabhānam rave attham kimjānāsīti' āha tam
'Aham jāne' ti vutto so otāresi sakam matam,
Vuttam vuttam viyākāsi virodham pi ca dassayi,
'Tena hi tvam sakam vādam otārehi,' ca codito
pālim āhābhidhammassa attham assa, na so'dhigā
Āha 'kass'eso manto'ti, 'Buddhamanto' ti so'bravi,
'dehi me tam' ti vutte hi 'ganha pabbajja tam' iti
Mantatthī pabbajitvā so ugganhi Piṭakattayam,
'ekāyano ayam maggo' iti pacchā tam aggahī
Buddhassa viya gambhīraghosattā naṃ viyākarum
'Buddhaghosa ti, so sobhi' Buddho viya mahītale
Tattha Ñāṇodayam nāma katvā pakaranam tadā
Dhammasanganiyākāsi kaccham Atthasālinim
Parittatthakathañ c'eva kātum ārabhi buddhimā,
tam disvā Revato thero idam vacanam abravi
'Pālimattamidhānītam, n'atthi atthakathā idha,
tathācariyavādā ca bhinnarūpā na vijjare
Sīhalaṭṭhakathā suddhā, Mahindena matīmatā
Sangītittayam ārūḷham Sammāsambuddhadesitam
Sāriputtādigītañ ca kathāmaggam samekkhiya
katā Sīhalabhāsāya Sīhalesu pavattati
Tam tattha gantvā sutvā tvam Māgadhānam niruttiyā
parivattehi, sā hoti sabbalokahitāvahā '
Evam vutto pasanno so nikkhamitvā tato imam
dīpaṃ āgā imass'eva rañño kāle mahāmati
Mahāvihāram sampatto vihāram sabbasādhunam
Mahāpadhānagharam gantvā Saṃghapālassa santikā
Sīhalatthakatham sutvā theravādañ ca sabbaso
'Dhammassāmissa eso va adhippāyo' ti nicchiya
Tattha samgham samānetvā 'kātum atthakatham mama
potthake detha sabbe' ti āha, vimamsitum sa tam
Samgho gāthādvayam tassa dāsi 'sāmatthiyam tava
ettha dassehi, tam disvā sabbe demāti potthake '
Piṭakattayam etth'eva saddhim atthakathāya so
Visuddhimaggam nāmakā samgahetvā samāsato
Tato samgham samūhetvā Sambuddhamatakovidam
Mahābodhisamīpamhi so tam vācetum ārabhi
Devatā tassa nepuññam pakāsetum mahājane
chādesum potthakam, so pi dvattikkhattum pi tam akā.
Vācetum tatiyevāre potthake samudāhate
potthakadvayam aññam pi santhapesum tahim marū.
Vācayimsu tadā bhikkhū potthakattayam ekato,
ganthato atthato vāpi pubbāparavasena vā
Theravādehi pālihi pādehi vyañjanehi ca
aññathattam ahū n'eva potthakesu pi tīsu pi
Atha ugghosayi samgho tuṭṭhahattho visesato
'nissamsayaṃ sa Metteyyo' iti vatvā punappunam
saddhim aṭṭhakathāyādā potthake Piṭakattaye,
Ganthākare vasanto so vihāre dūrasamkare

who had achieved the knowledge of the three "*Vedas*", and possessed great aptitude in attaining acquirements, indefatigable as a schismatic disputant, and himself a schismatic wanderer over Jambudīpa, established himself in the character of a *disputant, in a certain* vihāra, *and was in the habit of* repeating by night the views of Patañjali, perfect in all their component parts, and sustained throughout in the same lofty strain. A certain Mahāthera, Revata, becoming acquainted with him there and (saying to himself), "This individual is a person of profound knowledge; it will be worthy (of me) to convert him," enquired, "who is this who is braying like an ass?" (The Brāhmaṇa) replied to him, "Thou canst define, then, the meaning conveyed in the bray of asses." On (the thera) rejoining, "I can define it", he (the Brāhmaṇa) exhibited the extent of the knowledge he possessed. (The thera) criticized each of his propositions and pointed out in what respect they were fallacious. He who had been thus refuted, said, "well, then, descend to thy own creed"; and he propounded to him a passage from the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*. He (the Brāhmaṇa) could not divine the signification of that (passage); and enquired, "whose manto is this?" "It is the Buddha's manto." On his exclaiming, "Impart it to me" (the thera) replied, "Enter the sacerdotal order." He who was desirous of acquiring the knowledge of the *Piṭakattaya*, subsequently coming to this conviction: "This is the sole road (to salvation)", became a convert to that faith. As he was as *profound in his (ghoso) eloquence as the Buddha himself, they* conferred on him the appellation of Buddhaghosa (the voice of the Buddha); and throughout the world he became as renowned as the Buddha. Having there (in Jambudīpa) composed an original work called "*Ñāṇodayam*" he, at the same time, wrote the chapter called *Atthasālinī* on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* (one of the commentaries on the Abhidhammo). Revata thera then observing that he was desirous of undertaking the compilation of a "*Paritta-aṭṭhakathā*" (a general commentary on the *Piṭakattaya*), thus addressed him: "The text alone (of the *Piṭakattaya*) has been preserved in this land: the *Aṭṭhakathā* are not extant here; nor is there any version to be found of the texts of the different schools of thought. The Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathā are genuine. They were composed in the

Pariwattesi sabbā pi Sīhalaṭṭhakathā tadā
sabbesam mūlabhāsāya Māgadhāya niruttiyā
Sattānam sabbabhāsānam sā ahosi hitāvahā,
theriyācariyā sabbe Pālim viya tam aggahum
'*Atha kattabbakiccesu gatesu pariniṭṭhitim*
vanditum so Mahābodhim Jambudīpam upāgami'

Sinhalese language by the inspired and profoundly wise Mahindo, who had previously consulted the discourse of the Buddha, authenticated at the three convocations, and the dissertations and arguments of Sāriputta. and others, and they are extant among the Sinhalese. Repairing thither, and studying the same, translate (them) according to the rules of the grammar of the Magadhas. It will be an act conducive to the welfare of the whole world." Having been thus advised, this eminently wise personage rejoicing therein, departed from thence, and visited this island in the reign of this monarch (Mahānāma). On reaching the Mahāvihāra (at Anurādhapura) he entered the Mahāpadhāna Hall, the most splendid of the apartments in the vihāra, and listened to the Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathā, and the Theravāda, from the beginning to the end, propounded by the thera Saṅghapāla; and became thoroughly convinced that they conveyed the true meaning of the doctrines of the Lord of Dhamma. Thereupon paying reverential respect to the priesthood, he thus petitioned: "I am desirous of translating the *Atthakathā*; give me access to all your books." The priesthood for the purpose of testing his qualifications gave only two *gāthās* saying: "Hence prove thy qualification; having satisfied ourselves on this point, we will then let thee have all our books." From these (taking these *gāthās* for his text), and consulting the *Pitakattaya*, together with the *Aṭṭhakathā* and condensing them into an abridged form, he composed the commentary called the "*Visuddhimaggam*". Thereupon having assembled the priesthood who had acquired a thorough knowledge of the doctrines of the Buddha, at the Bo-tree, he commenced to read out (the work he had composed). The gods in order that they might make his (Buddhaghosa's) gifts of wisdom celebrated among men, rendered that book invisible. He however, for a second and third time, recomposed it. When he was in the act of producing his book for the third time, for the purpose of propounding it, the *devatās* restored the other two copies also. The (assembled) priests then read out the three books simultaneously. In those three versions, neither in a meaning nor in a single misplacement by transposition, nay even in the thera controversies, and in the text (of the *Piṭakattaya*), was there in the measure of a verse, or in the letter of a word, the slightest variation. Thereupon the priesthood rejoicing, again and again fervently shouted forth, saying, "Most assuredly this is Metteyyo (Buddho) himself"; and made over to him the books in which the *Piṭakattaya* were recorded, together with the *Aṭṭhakathā*. Taking up his residence in the secluded Ganthākāra vihāra at Anurādhapura, he trans-

lated, according to the grammatical rules of Māgadhī, which is the root of all languages, the whole of the Sinhalese *Aṭṭhakathā* (into Pāli). This proved an achievement of the utmost consequence to all languages spoken by the human race. All the *Theras* and *Ācariyas* held this compilation in the same estimation as the text (of the *Piṭakattaya*). Thereafter, the objects of his mission having been fulfilled, he returned to Jambudīpa to worship at the Bo-tree (at Uruvelā in Magadha).'

The supplementary chapters of the *Mahāvaṃsa* containing an account of Buddhaghosa were written by Dhammakitti in the thirteenth century and several centuries after Buddhaghosa's time. He must have had a definite tradition to guide him. He might have availed himself, as the late Professor Rhys Davids suggests, of 'the tradition as preserved at the Great Minster in Anurādhapura in written documents now no longer extant'. The whole account here given in the *Cūlavaṃsa* bears the impress of truth on it. Dhammakitti states the following facts, each of which gives rise to a problem for research: (1) the contemporaneity of Buddhaghosa's visit to Ceylon and stay there during the reign of Mahānāma who became the king of the island in the fifth century; (2) his birth and early education in a Brahmin family of Bodhgayā; (3) his proficiency in the Vedic and Brahmanical sciences and arts, particularly in the system of Patañjali; (4) his subsequent wanderings in India as a disputant; (5) his defeat in a philosophical controversy at the hands of the Buddhist Thera called Revata who was evidently the head of a Buddhist monastery somewhere in India; (6) the writing of a treatise by the name of *Ñāṇodaya*, a commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* named *Atthasālinī*, and a *Paritta*-commentary meaning either a commentary on the *Parittas* or a concise commentary on the *Piṭakas*; (7) his stay at the Mahāvihāra of Anurādhapura when the Venerable Saṅghapāla was its acknowledged head; (8) his intimate acquaintance with the three *Piṭakas*; (9) the writing of the *Visuddhimagga* as a monumental work of exposition by way of interpreting two verses from the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*; and (10) the translation made by him of all the *Pitaka* commentaries from the Sinhalese into Māgadhī meaning Pāli.

The Burmese tradition as recorded by Bishop Bigandet also points to the beginning of the fifth century as the time when Buddhaghosa visited the shores of the Martaban. Thus writes the Bishop in his *Life or Legend of Gaudama*[1]:

---

[1] Capt. T. Rogers, Buddhaghosa's *Parables*, p. xvi, fn 1.

'It is perhaps as well to mention here an epoch which has been at all times famous in the history of Buddhism in Burma. I allude to the voyage which a religious[1] of Thaton, named Budhaghosa (Buddhaghosa), made to Ceylon, in the year of religion 943—400 A.C. The object of this voyage was to procure a copy of the scriptures. He succeeded in his undertaking. He made use of the Burmese or rather Talaing characters, in transcribing the manuscripts which were written with the characters of Magatha. The Burmans lay much stress upon that voyage, and always carefully note down the year it took place. In fact, it is to Budhaghosa (Buddhaghosa) that the people living on the shores of the Gulf of Martaban owe the possession of the Buddhist scriptures. From Thaton, the collection made by Budhaghosa (Buddhaghosa) was transferred to Pagan, six hundred and fifty years after it had been imported from Ceylon.'

Dhammakitti's Buddhaghosa who stayed at the Mahāvihāra during the reign of Mahānāma was Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*. He was not certainly the author of the commentaries on all the texts of the three *Pitakas*. There was no valid reason for representing him indiscriminately as the author of all the commentaries. There were other capable men of South India and Ceylon to share the labours with him. The question is aptly raised if Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, was also the author of the *Vinaya commentary* called *Samantapāsādikā* as well as the author of the *Paramatthajotikā* which is a serial commentary on the *Khuddakapāṭha, Dhammapada, Sutta-nipāta* and *Jātaka*.

The name of the monastery in India where Buddhaghosa met the Thera Revata is not mentioned, nor does the name of this Thera find mention in any of the personal references in Buddhaghosa's writings. From these references, it is clear that Buddhaghosa had resided at Kāñcīpura and other places in South India before he went across to Ceylon. The Mayūra Suttapaṭṭana, a mart for cotton fabric, is another important place in South India where he resided.

The statement that the canonical texts alone were brought there while there were no commentaries there in existence (*Pālimattam idhānītaṃ n'atthi aṭṭhakathā idha—Mahāvaṃsa*, Turnour, p. 251) is too categorical to stand scrutiny, and it is contradicted by the statement that Buddhaghosa had written the *Atthasālinī* as a commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* before he went to Ceylon. How could he write it if

[1] A 'religious' is 'one bound by monastic vows'.

there were no previous commentaries to guide him in the matter? The self-contradictory character of the account given by Dhammakitti is palpable from the wonderful story about the writing of the *Visuddhimagga* as the very first work of Buddhaghosa in Ceylon.

It is said that the Theras of Mahāvihāra had tested Buddhaghosa's capacity by giving him two stanzas (from the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*) to explain without allowing him to consult the Sinhalese commentaries. This means that Buddhaghosa produced this great work without any help from the Sinhalese commentaries, and for the matter of that from any commentaries available in India at the time. But the internal evidence of the *Visuddhimagga* itself gives the lie direct to this statement. In the body of the work, Buddhaghosa has expressly cited the authority of the *Aṭṭhakathā* without naming it—the *Aṅguttara-atthakathā*, *Majjhima-aṭṭhakathā*, *Saṃyutta-aṭṭhakathā* and *Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā*—not to speak of the views of some individual teachers of Ceylon. Evidently, then, the story which was designed to magnify the glory of Buddhaghosa and his erudition was the product of an after-thought.

There is nothing remarkable either in the *Nigamanas* appended to his works nor in their body to suggest Bodhgayā as his birthplace. There are two references to Pāṭaliputra in the *Visuddhimagga*, from both of which it is clear that Buddhaghosa's knowledge about it was not very definite.

In the first reference,[1] Buddhaghosa narrates the story of Thera Visākha who, while trading in Pāṭaliputra, was tempted to go to Tāmraparṇī when he heard that the island was an ideal place which shone forth, being adorned with the rows of religious shrines, where there were ample spaces for sitting and lying, where the climate and residences, the people and doctrine were congenial, in short, it was easy to obtain everything there. After giving the charge of his wealth to his wife and sons he started from his house and came to the sea-shore where he lived for a month waiting for a ship. Here in the meantime he earned one thousand by engaging himself in a certain business, and thereafter reached the Mahāvihāra in time. There he was ordained as a monk. In five years he learnt the two (Vinaya) *mātikās* (Tables of Contents), and thereafter choosing a suitable object of meditation (*kammaṭṭhāna*) went on staying at a monastery just for four months.

Presumably the story was based upon a current tradition or that found in the Sinhalese commentary consulted by him.

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, I, p. 312.

It was quite correct to say that a traveller from Pāṭaliputra, bound for Ceylon, had to embark in a ship on the sea-shore. But, like the Chinese pilgrim, Fā-Hien, he does not clearly mention the seaport, nor does he say how he reached there from Pāṭaliputra.

The second reference [1] goes to prove that to his knowledge, precisely as to that of the Theras of Ceylon, Pāṭaliputra was situated on the sea-coast, as will be evident from the statement: *sakala-Tambapaṇṇidīpe adisvā: paratīre Pāṭaliputte bhavissatīti disvā.*

A corrective supplied by other monks to the above statement made by the Theras of Ceylon is that Pāṭaliputra was a far off place (*Pāṭaliputtaṃ nāma dūre bhante*).

According to Dhammakitti's account, the *Attkasālinī* preceded the *Visuddhimagga*, while the introductory verses of the *Atthasālinī,* as we now have it, clearly presuppose the text of the *Visuddhimagga.*

The Thera Revata who is said to have been instrumental in converting Buddhaghosa to Buddhism is nowhere referred to in Buddhaghosa's works. On the other hand, he gracefully introduces to us the Most Venerable Jotipāla who resided previously with him in Kāñcīpura and other places in South India and subsequently also in the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. He refers in the same loving terms to the Most Venerable Buddhamitta who resided with him, previous to his going to Ceylon, at the Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana.

But there is nothing as yet in Buddhaghosa's personal reference to contradict the tradition that he stayed on in Ceylon and returned to India after finishing the works he undertook to write there. The two references cited above confirm this, since in both he does not omit to use the phrase, *pubbe vasantena,* which is indicative of his previous stay in certain places in South India. His subsequent sojourn in Ceylon is clearly indicated also by the clause, *vara-Tambapaṇṇidīpe Mahāvihāramhi vasanakāle pi,* meaning 'also during (our) stay at the Mahāvihāra in the great island of Tambapaṇṇi'.

The part of the traditional account speaking of his birth in a Brahmin family of India as well as of his earlier Brahmanical education, proficiency in the Vedic learning and the system of Patañjali may be taken for granted. So far as the history of Buddhism in India is concerned, all the great exponents of the faith and the system of thought, whether Moggaliputta Tissa, Nāgasena or Aśvaghoṣa, whether Nāgār-

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga,* II, p. 403.

juna, Dinnāga or Dharmakīrtti, were all born in Brahmin families and won over from Brahmanism.

The part of the account associating Buddhaghosa with the Most Venerable Saṅghapāla, the then leading Thera of the Mahāvihāra, is amply corroborated by Buddhaghosa's own *Nigamana* to the *Visuddhimagga*. The same remark holds true also of the tradition regarding the great task achieved by Buddhaghosa in presenting the Sinhalese commentaries in Pali which is the language of the Theravāda Canon. The fact of his intimate knowledge of the Pali canonical texts cannot be challenged.

The *Cūḷavaṃsa* tradition is very definite about Buddhaghosa's stay in Ceylon in the time of king Mahānāma who had reigned either for twenty or twenty-two or twelve years.[1] There is no epigraphic evidence found as yet to establish this synchronism. But the time indicated is very likely the time of Buddhaghosa's visit to Ceylon.

The primary importance of the *Cūḷavaṃsa* account, the legend of Buddhaghosa in the *Buddhaghosuppatti* and other traditions lies in the interesting points of enquiry which they suggest. The salient points that need orientation are as follows:

Buddhaghosa's age, early life and education, wanderings and conversion to Buddhism, career as a Buddhist teacher in South India and Ceylon, last days, personality, works and their chronology, predecessors and contemporaries, successors, historical information, mastery over language, literary style, method of exposition, indebtedness and originality, interpretation of Buddhism, literary and scientific contributions, and contributions to thought.

---

[1] *Cūlavamsa* (P.T S tr), Pt II, Intro , xi

CHAPTER II

PERSONAL HISTORY

With the personal history of Buddhaghosa are bound up questions of his age, early life and education, wanderings and conversion to Buddhism, subsequent career in India, career in Ceylon, last days and personality. We cannot therefore do full justice to that history without dealing with these topics one by one.

1. *Age*: The question which arises at the very outset is concerned with the age in which Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, had flourished. We have seen that the *Mahāvaṃsa-supplement* written by Dhammakitti in the thirteenth century refers Buddhaghosa's career in Ceylon to the reign of Mahānāma (A.D. 409–431 or 409–421). The Most Venerable Sanghapāla, a saintly Thera of great repute, was then the head of the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura. It was after taking his consent that Buddhaghosa began to write the *Visuddhimagga*, his first and famous work in Ceylon. Buddhadatta, as ably pointed out by Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta,[1] refers almost in terms to Saṅghapāla in the same verses forming the epilogue to his *Vinaya manual* called *Uttara-vinicchaya*:

> '*Bhadanta-Saṅghapālassa sucisallekhavuttino,*
> *Vinayācārayuttassa yuttassa paṭipattiyaṃ.*
> *Khanti-soraccamettādi-guṇabhūsitacetaso,*
> *ajjhesanaṃ gahetvāva karontena imaṃ mayā.*'[2]
>
> (*Buddhaghosa*)

> '*Khanti-soracca-sosīlya-buddhi-saddhā-dayādayo*
> *patiṭṭhitā guṇā yasmiṃ ratanān'iva sāgare*
> *Vinayācārayuttena tena sakkacca sādaraṃ*
> *yācito Saṅghapālena therena thiracetasā*
> *suciraṭṭhitikāmena Vinayassa mahesino.*'[3]
>
> (*Buddhadatta*)

Looking deeper into the two descriptions which are in language and substance almost the same, we cannot fail to

---

[1] *University of Ceylon Review*, Vol III, No. 1, April, 1945, p 40

[2] *Visuddhimagga*, II, pp 711-2

[3] *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, edited by Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta, Vol. I, p. xvi, Vol II, p 303.

notice that in the case of Buddhaghosa the reference attaches a greater amount of personal dignity to Saṅghapāla who figures as the common factor. In his case the person referred to is the acknowledged head of the Mahāvihāra to fulfil whose behest he undertook to produce his masterly treatise. In the case of Buddhadatta, on the contrary, the reference is to an equal in rank who 'courteously and lovingly' (*sakkacca sādaram*) asked him to write the *Vinaya manual.* If this common reference be used as a sound basis of contemporaneity of the two Pāli scholiasts and writers, Buddhadatta will have to be regarded as the elder contemporary. Apart from this there is no other direct evidence as yet to connect them chronologically. In later Buddhist historical traditions either Buddhadatta or Buddhaghosa is described as the younger man of the two, but they are certainly represented as contemporaries. The former is known as a native of Uragapura (Uraiyūr) near Trichinopoli. He himself speaks patriotically of the kingdom of Cola and associates his literary activity with the reign of the Accuta king Accuta-Vikkanta or Accuta-Vikkama of the Kalabbha (Kalabhra) or Kalamba (Kadamba) family. As for his residence, he refers us to a grand monastery built by Veṇhudāsa (Viṣṇudāsa) or Kaṇhadāsa (Kṛṣṇadāsa) in the Kāveripaṭṭana on the bank of the river Kāverī. The Kāveripaṭṭana, otherwise called Maṅgala Bhūtamaṅgala, is identified with Puhar, Pukar or Kāveripaḍḍanaṃ at the mouth of the Kāverī, while Maṅgala Bhūtamaṅgala is identified with the village of Pallivritta Bhūtamaṅgalaṃ on the banks of the Vennār, a branch of the Kāverī. King Acyuta Acyutavikrānta or Acyutavikrama remains unidentified till now. The well-known Pallava king Siṃhaviṣṇu is said to have defeated the Kalabhra chiefs in the last quarter of the sixth century, while the Kalabhras appeared to have ruled the Cola country in earlier times. The Kalambas (Kadambas) as a ruling people are known to have established their suzerainty in Kanārā and Western Mysore from the third to the sixth century, and subsequently in Vijayanagar, maintaining the tradition of the Acyuta Rāyas. Whether of the Kalabhra or Kadamba family, certain it is that Buddhadatta's contemporary king Acyuta Acyutavikrānta reigned in the kingdom of Cola previous to the establishment of the Pallava rule there by Siṃhaviṣṇu towards the close of the sixth century. The *Skanda Purāṇa* preserves the tradition of an unnamed ancient prosperous king of Cola during whose reign flourished a pious Vaiṣṇava saint called Viṣṇudāsa who successfully stood against the performance of the costly Brahmanical sacrifices involving the slaughter of animals.

Kāñcīpura (Conjeeveram on the lower Pennār below the city of Madras) is mentioned as the then capital of Cola. The importance of Kāñcīpura as the chief town in the country of Cola is equally testified to by Buddhaghosa. But unfortunately the most celebrated Pali commentator does not mention the name of any contemporary king of either India or Ceylon. In the epilogue to the *Vinaya commentary* called *Samantapāsādikā*, its author definitely states that he began to write this work in the 20th year and completed it just at the commencement of the 21st year of the reign of a contemporary king of Ceylon bearing the distinctive epithets of Siri-kuḍḍa, Siri-pāla and Siri-nivāsa. There is no valid ground to identify him with Mahānāma. The claim is made for king Kitti-Siri-Meghavaṇṇa (A.D. 334–362) who was a contemporary of Samudragupta. Thus, even if the author of the *Visuddhimagga* and that of the *Vinaya commentary* be one and the same person, the age of Buddhaghosa remains problematical until, perchance, the contemporary kings be satisfactorily identified on either side. Let us see if the point can be decided on other grounds.

We may ask—Is the reign of Mahānāma (A.D. 409–431) an improbable age for Buddhaghosa's literary career in Ceylon? Fā-Hien is generally regarded as the earlier Chinese pilgrim who visited India and Ceylon during the reign of Candragupta II, the son and successor of Samudragupta whose contemporary was king Kitti-Siri-Meghavaṇṇa of Ceylon. It was during their reign that the Mahābodhi Saṅghārāma was erected at Bodhgayā for the residence of the monks from Ceylon. It was during the reign of the latter that the famous Tooth-relic of the Buddha is said to have been taken from Dantapura in Kaliṅga to Ceylon where it is being honoured till the present time. The later Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang noticed the Mahābodhi Saṅghārāma at Bodhgayā of which the foundation survives to this day. Fā-Hien noticed three monasteries there at the time of his visit but says nothing particularly. It cannot be inferred from his account that the three monasteries then in existence included the great monastery erected by Meghavaṇṇa specifically for the monks from Ceylon. While in Ceylon, Fā-Hien witnessed during his stay for two years how every year a grand procession led by the reigning king was organized at the Abhayagiri Vihāra in honour of the Tooth-relic,—an event which was not possible before Meghavaṇṇa's time. He also knew about an eloquent Buddhist preacher from India who was hailed with joy in the island, and he himself was present when the Indian preacher delivered a discourse

exhorting his audience to do meritorious deeds and based it upon the wanderings of the Buddha's bowl until the advent of the Future Buddha Maitreya. The contemporary head of the Abhayagiri was a Śramaṇa called Dhammakitti (*Ta-mo-kui-ti*). The contemporary head of the Mahāvihāra who was venerated as an Arahant but whose name is not mentioned, died then and was given a grand funeral.

The powerful Buddhist preacher from India was not certainly Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, nor the author of the *Vinaya commentary*, but some other person. Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga* records the tradition of an earlier Indian visitor who was a trader from Pāṭaliputta and was ordained as a monk in Ceylon where after finishing the study of the two Vinaya *mātikās* (i.e. Pātimokkhas) he took to the life of meditation, making it a point not to stay at a monastery for more than four months. There is no further account of his religious career.

The *Dīpavaṃsa* which is the earlier of the two Pāli chronicles of Ceylon is quoted by name in the general introductions to the *Kathāvatthu Aṭṭhakathā*[1] and the *Samanta-pāsādikā*.[2] An earlier *Aṭṭhakathā Mahāvaṃsa* is presupposed by them instead of Mahānāma's *Mahāvaṃsa*. Both the chronicles close their account with the reign of king Mahāsena, the father and predecessor of king Kitti-Siri-Meghavaṇṇa (A.D. 334–62) who caused the Mahābodhi Saṅghārāma to be erected at Bodhgayā during the reign of Samudragupta and was therefore a great contemporary of the latter.

The age of Buddhaghosa cannot, in the absence of the name of a contemporary king, whether of India or of Ceylon, be fixed later than the reign of Mahānāma until it can be proved that the *Dīpavaṃsa* account was finally closed. It must have been closed indeed prior to the reign of Dhātusena (A.D. 460–78) who made endowments for its wide popularity.

None of the kings of India and Ceylon who are incidentally mentioned in the *Visuddhimagga* and other works of Buddhaghosa, can be referred to a period later than the third century A.D. In the *Kathāvatthu Aṭṭhakathā* Buddhaghosa introduces the earlier eighteen Buddhist sects and many later sects in such a manner as to leave no room for doubt that they were all existing in his time: *seyyathā pi etarahi*, 'just as now'. The later sects comprise the Andhakas with the Pubbaseliyas, Aparaseliyas, Rājagirikas and

---

[1] *J.P.T.S.*, 1889, p. 3; B. C. Law, *The Debates Commentary* (*P.T.S.*), p. 3.
[2] *P.T.S.*, I, 74, 75.

Siddhatthikas as their subdivisions, the Hemavatikas, the Uttarāpathakas, and the Vetullakas, whose main doctrine is aptly described as *mahāsuññatāvāda* meaning the *śūnyavāda* doctrine of the great void.

These sects find mention in the Indian inscriptions which are all pre-Gupta in date. They are conspicuous by their absence in the Gupta and other later inscriptions.

It is certain that the *Vinaya commentary*, *Samantapāsādikā*, was written prior to A.D. 489 which is the date of its Chinese translation. The work in the main is the same as it was before the Chinese translator. The epilogue to the *Vinaya commentary* distinctly alludes to a troublesome time through which the country had passed and sets forth the diffidence in the author's mind as to having better times ahead. Thus it shows how eager was the author to finish his work quickly. No such feelings are expressed by the great commentator Buddhaghosa.

Mahānāma's *Great Chronicle* speaks of the pariveṇa Saṅghapāla which was in existence in the time of king Goṭhābhaya Meghavaṇṇa (A.D. 302–15), father of Jeṭhatissa and Mahāsena, and that in a very important historical connection. It inevitably led to the circumstances in which the continued rivalry between the two vihāras in Anurādhapura resulted in the Abhayagiri becoming a centre of heresy and heterodoxy, particularly a ground of great advantage and attraction to the Vaitulyakas from the Cola country on the Indian shore. The Vetullavāda got a definite footing in the island even prior to the reign of Vohāratissa. The *Samantapāsādikā* records the tradition of king Bhātika or Bhātikābhaya (A.D. 38–66) who tried to settle a dispute on a Vinaya issue which arose between the partisans of the two rival vihāras through his personal intervention. The *Mahāvaṃsa* account lays bare the fact that with their growing power the Vaitulyakas endangered the position of Theravāda and became thus a cause of terror to the monks of the Mahāvihāra who, to get rid of them, caused them to be driven out of the island by king Goṭhābhaya Meghavaṇṇa. To make good their cause a powerful Colian monk, Saṅghamitta, came to the island. He is said to have been an expert in charms and the like. He came in as a capable disputant and defeated in argument the monks of the Mahāvihāra at Thūpārāma. The spokesman of the congregation of Ceylon monks was the Thera Goṭhābhaya, a namesake and maternal uncle of the reigning king and a Thera from the pariveṇa of Saṅghapāla, which was probably one of the component buildings of the Mahāvihāra. The defeat of the Thera

Goṭhābhaya in argument enabled the Mahāyāna priest to become a favourite of the king.

Now, the memories of this important controversy seem to be very fresh in the commentaries of the great exegetist Buddhaghosa and the commentary on the *Vinaya Piṭaka*. One may seek indeed to find in Saṅghapāla of Goṭhābhaya's time the personal identity of the Most Venerable Sanghapāla, the head of the Mahāvihāra, who figures as a common personal factor to Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa. But there is no positive evidence as yet to establish this identity as a fact.

To my mind, the age of the great Buddhaghosa as suggested in the *Mahāvaṃsa supplement* may not have been exactly what it was, but it takes us undoubtedly very near to it. If the upper limit of this age as claimed be not earlier than the reign of Goṭhābhaya Meghavaṇṇa, its lower limit may *equally be claimed as not later than the reign of Mahānāma* who stands as a contemporary of Kumāragupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty.

2. *Early life and education*: The part of the tradition representing Buddhaghosa as a person born in a Brahmin family and brought up in the Brāhmanical tradition may be treated as quite authentic. It is also certain that he was an Indian who went to Ceylon from the country of Cola in South India when Kāñcīpura was its capital. It is not unlikely that he belonged to Northern India, and particularly to that portion of Northern India which is known to the Buddhists as the Middle Country (Majjhimadesa). We have seen that he had no direct knowledge of Pāṭaliputra. It was only by hearsay that he was aware of the fact that a person intending to go to Ceylon might undertake a sea-voyage for which he had to come first to a seaport and wait for the ship. But he was unaware of the name of this port. What is most ludicrous in the account of Visākha's voyage to Ceylon is that Pāṭaliputra itself is placed on the sea-shore. His description of the Bo-tree (Asvattha) of the Buddha Sākyamuni is legendary and supernatural. Such a description of the tree is unexpected of a man born in the vicinity of the Bo-terrace. As regards the Middle Country, he incidentally observes that with the people of this part of the Āryāvartta the meat of the peafowl and such like birds was a delicacy. His comment on the seven sacred rivers mentioned in the *Vatthupama Sutta* is rather very meagre. He has virtually nothing to say about the location of the Bāhukā, Adhikakkā, Bāhumatī and Sarassatī. Elsewhere he points out that the Sundarikā was a river in Kosala. The Payāgā was known to him as a bathing ghat of the Ganges, whereas in point of fact it was the confluence of

the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā. As regards the Gayā, he tells us that it meant a bathing place erected in the Maṇḍalavāpi (*Maṇḍalavāpisaṇṭhāna-titthameva*). The word Phaggu (Sk. Phalgu) which is known in Indian literature as the name of the river of Gayā is taken by him to be the name of the asterism of Phālguna (*Phogguṇanakkhattameva*). He adds by way of a further explanation that the significance of the name of Phaggu lay in the fact that the people came there for bathing preferably under the constellation of Uttaraphālgunī in the month of Phālguna. He rightly suggests that a special emphasis was laid on *Gayā* for the reason that it passed as the best of the *tīrthas* of the time (*loke Gayā saṃmattarā*). It is very strange indeed that he has nothing to say on the importance of the river of Gayā. Elsewhere he correctly points out that the Sundarikā was a river in Kosala. But the representation of Gayā as a tank (Gayā-pokkharaṇī) instead of a river is unexpected from an inhabitant of Gayā. The association of the hot springs with Mt. Vebhāra which is one of the five hills of Rājagaha is interesting. But this is done in connection with the name of *Tapoda* which in itself is suggestive of hot springs, and the information supplied might be a traditional one. The traditional character of certain historical facts recorded is patent in many instances. It is said, for instance, in the *Vinaya commentary* that, according to the Andhaka Aṭṭhakathā, the *Magadhanāḷi*[1] which was a standard measure was equal to 12½ *palas*, while according to the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā of Ceylon, the *nāḷi* usually in use in Ceylon was larger than that of Damiḷa (Drāviḍa), the Sīhala *nāḷi* being equal to 1½ *nālis* of Magadha. The only fact of the personal history of the author of this commentary to be derived from this is that he drew his information from the two earlier authorities. It is evident therefore that the information was not supplied from his personal knowledge.

The tradition of king Sātavāhana (variant, Setavāhana) lingers in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*,[2] while the *Vinaya commentary* incidentally refers to the Rudradāmaka and similar coins rather in their debased forms.[3] Both the allusions go to connect their authors with the Western India and the Narmadā and Godāvarī regions at the western end of the Vindhya range. The great Buddhaghosa locates the Vattaniya hermitage in the Vindhya region and preserves the tradition of a miracle performed there by the Thera Assagutta mentioned in the introductory part of the *Milinda*. The

[1] *Samantapāsādikā*, III, 702. [2] Vol I, p 303.
[3] *Samantapāsādikā* (Sinhalese Ed.), I, p 172

probability of Assagutta being the same person as Aśvaghoṣa, the author of the *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda kāvyas*, cannot altogether be denied. Aśvaghoṣa's predilection for the Vindhya region is manifest in his location of the Sāṅkhya school of Arāḍa there,[1] instead of in the neighbourhood of Rājagṛha. There are a few doctrinal points common to the writings of Aśvaghoṣa and Buddhaghosa, from which it may be inferred that either the latter was acquainted with the views of the former or that they had derived those views from a common source.

The Cūḷavaṃsa tradition of the wanderings of Buddhaghosa previous to his conversion to Buddhism may also be taken to have a foundation in fact. The Thera Revata who is said to have defeated him in argument and converted him to the Buddhist faith finds no mention in his works. Unfortunately even the name of the monastery of Revata and the part of India where it was situated are not mentioned in the *Cūḷavaṃsa*. But the personal references in Buddhaghosa's works leave no room for doubt that he had moved about from the Western India and Vindhya region towards further south until he found himself ultimately in the island of Ceylon.

It was in the caves of the Western India and Vindhya region and along the banks of the Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā that the various Buddhist sects and schools of thought established themselves. The Amarāvatī, Jagayyapeta and Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa on the banks of the Kṛṣṇā were particularly the three strongholds of the Andhaka sect with the Pubbaseliyas, Aparaseliyas, Rājagirikas and Siddhatthikas as their four main subdivisions.

While commenting on *aṭṭhidhopana*, which occurs in the *Dīgha* list of games and sports, Buddhaghosa speaks of the barbarous custom of washing the bones of the dead which was prevalent in the countries of South India.[2]

Dhammakitti's account of Buddhaghosa's proficiency in the Vedas and in other branches of Brāhmanical learning is substantially correct.

Buddhaghosa in his *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* makes mention of the four Vedas, viz. *Irubbeda* (Ṛgveda), *Yajubbeda* (Yajurveda), *Sāmaveda*, and *Athabbaṇa* Veda.[3] He also shows his acquaintance with the details of Vedic sacrifices. He says that *yiṭṭha* is called the great sacrifice (*mahāyāga*) and *huta* is hospitality offered to the persons attending the sacrifice. He speaks of *aggihoma*[4] which, he adds, derives its name from

---

[1] *Buddhacarita*, Canto 7, v. 54
[2] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p. 84.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, p 247.
[4] *Ibid*, I, p. 93.

the fact that it is performed by burning sacrificial things in fire produced by wood. According to him, *dabbihoma* is a kind of *aggihoma* and is so called because this sacrifice is performed by putting husks into the fire by means of a wooden spoon. He says that *kaṇa* is red powder which adheres to the grain of rice under the husk. *Taṇḍula* includes sāli-rice and other grasses. *Sappi* is *go-sappi*, (cow-ghee), etc. *Tela* is sesamum oil, etc. The *mukha homa* is spoken of as a kind of sacrifice in which the mustard seeds, etc., are thrown in the fire by taking them in the mouth. The *lohita-homa* is described as a kind of sacrifice.

The tradition speaking of his familiarity with the system of Patañjali (Patañjali-mata) meaning broadly the Sāṅkhya-Yoga doctrine is corroborated by his discussion of the position of *avijjā* in Buddhism as compared with the *Pakati* (*Prakṛti*) of the *Pakativāda* meaning the Sāṅkhya philosophy.[1] The use of the analogy of *andha-paṅgu* (the purblind and the cripple) for illustrating the relation between *nāma-rūpa*,[2] too, testifies to his knowledge of the same system of Brāhmanical thought. The employment of the term *samūha* in his commentaries[3] cannot but remind us of his indebtedness to the Yoga-sūtra, III, 44, of Patañjali and Vyāsa's comment thereon.[4]

Similarly the distinction in meaning made by Buddhaghosa between the term *hetu* as employed in Theravāda Buddhism and the same term as commonly understood in the sense of the major premise in syllogistic reasoning bears evidence to his acquaintance with the Nyāya system.[5]

Buddhaghosa's indebtedness to Patañjali's tradition in Brāhmanical literature may be realized in another sphere, namely, the method and style of his writing. It must have been following the method and style of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* that while commenting on a Pāli passage, expression or word, he has brought in his historical, geographical, scientific or similar knowledge to bear upon the subject. His prose style, too, is in many respects like that of Patañjali. He has occasionally cited in Pāli the grammatical *sūtras* of Pāṇini. As for his indebtedness to the master grammarian Pāṇini,

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, II, p 525. [2] *Ibid.*, p 411.

[3] *Atthasālinī*, p. 61 *Samūhasankhāto pana samayo anekesam sahuppattim dīpeti* Cf *Sumangalavilāsinī*, I, p 167 . *pathavikāyo paṭhavisamūho vā*

[4] *Ayutasiddha-vayabhedānugatah sanūho dravyam iti Patañjalih.* Also, *Sāmānya-viśeṣa-samudāyo'tra dravyam, dviṣṭo hi sanūhah pratyastamita-bhedāvayavānugatah śarīram vṛkṣo yūtham vanam iti.*

[5] *Visuddhimagga*, II, p 532 *Paṭiññā hetū ti ādisu hi loke vacanāvayavo hetū ti vuccati Sāsane pana, 'ye dhammā hetuppabhavā'ti ādisu kāranam 'tayo kusalahetū, tayo akusalahetū' ti ādisu mūlam hetū ti vuccati.* Cf. *Kathāvatthuppakarana-aṭṭhakathā*, *J.P.T.S.*, 1889, pp. 153 foll., 158, 165–7, 181, 184, 198-9.

the reader may be referred to his explanation of the word, *indriya*, in the *Visuddhimagga* (pp. 491-92) where we read:

Ko pana nesaṃ indriyaṭṭho nāmā ti? Indaliṅgaṭṭho indriyaṭṭho indadesitaṭṭho indriyaṭṭho; indadiṭṭhaṭṭho indriyaṭṭho, indasiṭṭhaṭṭho indriyaṭṭho; indajuṭṭhaṭṭho indriyaṭṭho; so sabbo pi idha yathāyogaṃ yujjati .....

This explanation of the word, *indriya*, is evidently reminiscent of Pāṇini's *Sūtra*, v. 2, 93: *Indriyaṃ indraliṅgaṃ indradṛṣṭaṃ indrajuṣṭaṃ indradattaṃ iti vā.*[1]

Pāṇini gives his sanction to the use of the word, *āpatti*, in the sense of *prāpti*. In this very sense the word, *āpatti*, is sought to be explained in the *Samantapāsādikā*.

The masterly anatomical description of the thirty-two parts of the body given by him in the *Visuddhimagga*[2] must be set down to his credit as a student of the science of medicine, if it were not based entirely upon the authority of the Sinhalese commentaries utilized by him.

It may, however, be observed that he nowhere shows his knowledge of the Upaniṣads. There is nowhere in his writings evidence of his acquaintance with the two great Sanskrit epics, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In connection with his explanation of the word, *akkhānaṃ*, he speaks of the narration of the episodes of what he calls Bhārata-yuddha and Sītā-haraṇa,[3] which is evidently a very incomplete description of the great events and hardly suggests the idea of a *magnum opus* like the Great Epic, Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*.

3. *Buddhistic career in South India*: According to the Cūḷavaṃsa account, Buddhaghosa acquired sufficient proficiency in the *Three Piṭakas* since his change of religion and ordination as a monk to be able to write a treatise by the name of *Ñāṇodaya* ('The Awakening of Knowledge') before going to Ceylon. It is said that he made it a supplement to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* which is usually counted as the first Book of the Pāli *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*. It was when he began to write thereafter another work by the name of *Atthasālinī* which is a concise commentary (*parittaṭṭhakathā*) presumably on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*[4] that he was advised and persuaded to go to

---

[1] Cf *J.P T.S.*, 1906-7, pp 172-3

[2] *P.T.S*, I, pp. 249–265, I, pp 353–363. Cf *Paramatthajotikā on the Khuddaka-pāṭha*, I, pp 41–68, cf *Sammohavinodanī* (Sinhalese Ed.), pp. 49–63.

[3] *Sumangalavilāsinī*, I, p. 84

[4] This seems to be the correct interpretation of the *Cūḷavaṃsa* verses stating:

Tattha Ñāṇodayaṃ nāma katvā pakaraṇaṃ tadā
Dhammasaṅgaṇiyā'kāsi kaṇḍaṃ so Atthasālinīṃ.
Parittaṭṭhakathañ c'eva kātuṃ ārabhi buddhimā ..

(Ed. Geiger, *P.T.S.*, p. 18.)

Ceylon by his teacher Revata who frankly said to him, 'The Pāli Canonical Texts only are brought here, but no commentaries are available here; likewise the works of the different schools of teachers do not exist'.

It seems very likely that the text of the *Ñāṇodaya*, which was the only work written by the great Buddhaghosa in India, is still in Siam. If the information supplied by the Thera Dhammatilaka, the author of the modern Siamese edition of the *Visuddhimagga*, be correct, the work contains fuller details of Buddhaghosa's life and scholarly career.

It is evident from his personal references in the *Nigamanas* to his commentaries on the *Majjhima, Saṃyutta* and *Aṅguttara Nikāyas* that his career immediately before his mission to Ceylon was confined to the country of Cola or Damiḷa (Drāviḍa) in the Deccan. He resided at Kāñcīpura and other places together with the Most Venerable Jotipāla at whose instance he undertook to write the two *Nikāya*-commentaries called the *Sāratthappakāsinī* and *Manorathapūraṇī*. The high compliment paid to him is worthy of a Thera who was venerated by Buddhaghosa as a teacher or preceptor. Among 'other places', he mentions by name the Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana or Mayūrarūpapaṭṭana, evidently an emporium of trade which may probably be identified with Mayaveram on a middle distributary of the Kāverī. Here the Most Venerable Buddhamitta asked Buddhaghosa to write the *Papañcasūdanī* when he was staying together with the latter before his going to Ceylon.[1] If the *Saddhammasaṅgaha* refers to Nāgapaṭṭana (Negapatam at the mouth of a lower distributary of the Kāverī) as the port or sea-coast town where he embarked on board the ship carrying him across to Ceylon, there is nothing improbable in the account.[2]

Buddhaghosa's works contain his reminiscences of the Andhakas (Andhras) and the Damiḷas (Drāviḍas) who were known to him as Milakkhas (Mlecchas) or non-Aryan peoples.[3] In the *Visuddhimagga* he speaks of one hundred and one spoken dialects that were current in India of his time, and

---

From this, it is clear that Buddhaghosa had not written the *Atthasālinī* while he was in India but had just commenced to write a sort of *vṛtti* either on the *Dhammasangani* or his own treatise, *Ñānodaya*. Geiger adopts the variant, *kaccham*, meaning a *bhāṣya* or commentary (*kaccham-kathyam*), in which case the statement will mean either that Buddhaghosa made the *Ñānodaya* as a *bhāṣya* to the *Dhammas* or he wrote the *Atthasālinī* as a commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgani*. But the second interpretation does not tally with the tenor of the account. The word *kanda* is employed in the *Dhammasaṅgani* in the sense of a chapter or section, e.g. *cittakandam, rūpakaṇḍam*.

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, Pt. V, p. 109.

[2] *J P T S*, 1890, p. 53, '. . . . *Nāgapaṭṭanam sampāpuni*.'

[3] *Vibhanga-atthakathā*, 387-8, cf. *Samantapāsādikā*, I, 255.

from all of them he singles out the Māgadhī, meaning the language of the Theravāda canon. In his *Vibhaṅga Aṭṭhakathā* (pp. 387-88), he distinguishes the same as an Aryan form of speech from the eighteen typical non-Aryan languages (*Milakkhabhāsā*), such as the Oḍḍa (Audra), Kirāta, Andhaka, Yonaka (Yavana) and Damiḷa (Dravidian) *bhāsā*. In the *Samantapāsādikā*, the non-Aryan languages are typified by the Andhaka and Damiḷa *bhāsā*. In his *Dīgha* and *Aṅguttara Aṭṭhakathās*, Buddhaghosa characterizes the Damiḷa, Kirāta and Yavana dialects as languages abounding in consonants.

After finishing his treatise called *Ñāṇodaya* and his career in South India, Buddhaghosa went across to Ceylon which was known to him as the island of Sīhala (Siṃhala) as well as Tambapaṇṇi. The language of Siṃhala is counted in the *Suttanipāta Aṭṭhakathā* among the non-Aryan languages (*Milakkhabhāsā-pariyāpannā*).[1]

4. *Career in Ceylon*: According to Dhammakitti's *Mahāvaṃsa Supplement*, Buddhaghosa left for Ceylon obeying the instruction of his preceptor called Thera Revata. From the personal reference in the epilogue to his *Manorathapūraṇī*, it is evident that he stayed with the Most Venerable Jotipāla not only at Kāñcīpura and other places in the country of Coḷa or Drāviḍa but also at Mahāvihāra in the excellent island of Tambapaṇṇi.[2]

This statement on the part of Buddhaghosa, if authentic, may easily lead us to think that Jotipāla was the highly revered Thera who did not remain content by urging him to go to Ceylon but himself took him there. The Most Venerable Saṅghapāla was then the head of the Mahāvihāra. It is nothing but an exaggeration to say that he had not been allowed to make use of the Sinhalese Commentaries before his merit was severely tested, that is to say, before he succeeded in producing his monumental work called *Visuddhimagga*. A preliminary test of his erudition and intellectual capacity must have been held as a matter of course, and it is possible that he was given the two stanzas from the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* to explain, but that does not mean that the production of a masterly treatise like the *Visuddhimagga* was the immediate result. The internal evidence of the work itself goes to prove that he wrote it out after having an ample opportunity of studying the Sinhalese commentaries and acquainting himself with the current views of the teachers, particularly those

---

[1] *Paramatthajotikā*, II, p. 397

[2] *āyācito sumatinā therena Bhadanta-Jotipālena* |
Kāñcipurādisu mayā pubbe saddhiṃ vasantena ||
vara-Tambapaṇṇidīpe Mahāvihāre vasanakāle pi |

attached to the Mahāvihāra. It is quite probable that the library of the Mahāvihāra was known as the Ganthākara, not to say, Ganthāgāra.

The four works he wrote immediately after his *Visuddhimagga* were the commentaries on the first four Nikāyas or Āgamas which appear to have been followed by his commentaries on the seven *Abhidhamma* books.

The *Visuddhimagga* was undertaken in accordance with the behest of Saṅghapāla. Among the four *Nikāya Aṭṭhakathās*, the *Sumangalavilāsinī* was written at the request of Dāṭhanāga of the Sumaṅgala Vihāra, the *Papañcasūdanī*, at the instance of Buddhamitta of Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana, and the *Sāratthappakāsinī* and *Manorathapūraṇī*, at the instance of Jotipāla. The *Abhidhamma commentaries* are said to have been written at the request of the Bhikkhu or Yati Buddhaghosa who is now identified with the Culla-Buddhaghosa of the *Gandhavamsa* and regarded as the author of the *Paramatthajotikā*, a serial commentary on four books of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*.

Buddhaghosa's authorship of the *Vinaya Aṭṭhakathās* is challenged. If the author of these commentaries were also known by the name of Buddhaghosa, he was simply a namesake and a different individual altogether. We shall go into this question when we come to deal fully with Buddhaghosa's works. For the present it is sufficient to state that his literary career in Ceylon ended with the writing of the *Abhidhamma commentaries*.

5. *Reminiscences of Ceylon*: The *Visuddhimagga* and other works of Buddhaghosa are full of personal reminiscences. It is probable that many of them were already in the Sinhalese commentaries read and utilized by Buddhaghosa. But there are certainly some that bear a personal note and speak of his own observations. The traditional materials are so hopelessly blended together with those supplied by him that it is rather difficult to discriminate one from the other. We may proceed, however, on the assumption that whatever is there in his writings, he made it his own. Even apart from the *Jātakas* and other anecdotes in the Pāli commentaries that were mostly of an Indian origin, there were anecdotes of a purely Sinhalese origin in a process of growth until they were collected in the *Sahassavatthu* and subsequently in the *Rasavāhinī*. The reminiscences of Ceylon may conveniently be discussed under the following heads: the tradition of the kings, the tradition of the monasteries and fellow monks, the social and religious life of the people, the shrines and monasteries, and the arts and crafts.

Mention is made of a thera named Mahānāga of Kāḷavallimaṇḍapa and of the bhikkhus who took their abode in the vihāra at Kalambatittha, who with minds bent upon *Kammaṭṭhāna*, walking on foot near the village and taking palmful of water, looking on the road where quarrelsome and wicked persons, mad elephants, restive horses, etc., were to be found, used to go along their path.[1] The *Samantapāsādikā* mentions a thera named Cūḷābhaya who was well versed in the *Three Piṭakas*. He taught the bhikkhus in the Vinaya at the foot of the Lohapāsāda.[2] There is a reference also to two nāga kings named Cūḷodara and Mahodara who were subdued by the Blessed One.[3] Buddhaghosa refers to the story that Thera Mahānāga while going out after finishing his alms-begging in the village of Nakulanagara, saw a *therī* and requested her to take rice.[4] A reference is made to Abhaya Thera in the *Atthasālinī*, who was very hospitable to those who could recite the Dīgha Nikāya in the Cetiyapabbata. The story is told of the articles of hospitality having been stolen by thieves.[5] The *Atthasālinī* also mentions a thera named Piṅgalabuddharakkhita of Ambariya Vihāra who used to preach the Buddhist precepts.[6] A reference is made to a sinless *thera* living at Cittalapabbata, who had as his attendant an old recluse. One day while the attendant was walking behind the *thera* with alms-bowl and robes, he spoke to the *thera* thus, 'Venerable Sir, how are the Ariyas'? The answer was that the Ariyas were a people very difficult to be known.[7] Mention is also made of Cakkaṇa Upāsaka.[8]

In the *Sāratthappakāsinī*, it is stated that in the island of Ceylon, in the rest-houses of different villages there was no seat where a Bhikkhu taking his gruel did not obtain

---

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī* (MSS) pp 132-133 '*Evam Kāḷavallimaṇḍapavāsī Mahānāgathero viya-Kalamba (Galamba) tittha vihāre vassūpagata-bhikkhū viyā ca Kammaṭṭhānayutteneva cittena pādam uddharanto gāmasamīpam gantva (patvā) udakagandūsam katvā vīthiyo sallakkhetvā yattha surā-soṇḍadhuttādayo kalahakārakā caṇḍahatthi assādayo va n'atthi tam vīthim paṭipajjati.*' *Vide P T S* Ed., III, 188.

[2] III, p 591.

[3] *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p 120.

[4] *Atthasālinī* (*P.T S*), p 399· '... *Mahānāgatthero Nakulanagaragāme-piṇḍāya caritvā nikkhamanto therim disvā bhattena āpucchi*'

[5] *Ibid*, p. 399 '*Uppannalābhathāvarakaraṇe Dīghabhāṇakā Abhayattherassa hatthato paṭisanthāraṃ labhitvā Cetiyapabbate corehi bhaṇḍakassa aviluttabhāve vatthum kathetabbam.*'

[6] *Ibid*, p 103 '*Ambariyavihāravāsī Piṅgalabuddharakkhitattherassa santike sikkhāpadāni gahetvā ..*'

[7] *Atthasālinī*, p 350 '*Cittalapabbatavāsike kira khīṇāsavattherassa upaṭṭhāko buddhapabbajito ekadivasam therena saddhim piṇḍāyacaritvā therassa pattacīvaraṃ gahetvā piṭṭhito āgacchanto, theraṃ pucchi. 'Bhante ariyā nāma kīdisā ti? ... dujjanā āvuso ariyā.*'

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 103: '... *Sīhaladīpe Cakkaṇa-upāsakassa viya.*'

Arahatship.[1] Buddhaghosa further refers to the town of Icchānaṅgala where the king of righteousness dwelt as long as he liked.[2] In the same work, Buddhaghosa tells us that one day in the court-yard of the Mahācetiya young bhikkhus were engaged in getting their lessons by heart, behind them young bhikkhunīs were listening to the repetition, one of the bhikkhus having extended his hands that touched a bhikkhunī became a layman.[3] In the *Atthasālinī*, he refers to Penaṁbaṅgaṇa, a town in Ceylon, where there was a perpetual flow of charity, etc.[4]

In the *Visuddhimagga*, mention is made of *thera* Mahā Tissa who was in the habit of coming from Cetiyapabbata to Anurādhapura for alms.[5] Two members of a family are mentioned as coming out of Anurādhapura and gradually obtaining ordination at Thūpārāma.[6] A *thera* named Nāga of Kāraḷiyagiri gave a discourse on *dhātukathā* to the bhikkhus.[7] A reference is made to a *thera* named Cūḷābhaya who was versed in the *Three Piṭakas*, and learnt the *Aṭṭhakathās*.[8]

Buddhaghosa refers to Koṭapabbata which was a mountain in Rohaṇa which was one of the three main provinces of Ceylon.[9] He also mentions the Koraṇḍakavihāra which was a monastery in Ceylon. A young monk who was the nephew of the Elder of the Vihāra did not reveal his identity after returning from Rohaṇa where he went to study.[10] He refers to a great festival known as the Giribhaṇḍavāhana instituted by king Mahādāṭhika-mahānāga on the Cetiyagiri-

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī* (Sinhalese Ed.), p 131; *P.T.S.* Ed , III, 186.

[2] Cf. also the Chapter XXVI which deals with the consecration of Maricavaṭṭi Vihāra as described in the *Mahāvamsa* '*Icchānaṅgala-vanasaṇḍe Silakkhanda vāram bandhitvā samādhikontam ussāpetvā sabbaññutaññāṇasaram parivattayamāno dhammarājā yathābhirucitena vihārena viharati.*'

[3] *Sāratthapakāsinī* (Sinhalese Ed), p. 137. Mahācetiyaṅgaṇa appears to be the court-yard of Mahācetiya of Anurādhapura in Ceylon. It occurs in many places in the *Mahāvamsa*. For its description, see Parker's 'Ruined cities of Ceylon.' '*Atthepanasati pi sappāya sappāyam pariganhetvā sappāya parigganhanaṃ sappāya sampajaññam tatrāyam nayo Mahācetiyangane kira daharabhikkhū sajjhāyam ganhanti Tesam piṭṭhipasse dahara bhikkhuniyo dhammam suvanti. Tatreko daharo hattham pasārento kāyasamsaggam patvā teneva kāranena gihījāto.*'

[4] *Atthasālinī*, *P T.S* , p. 399.

[5] *Visuddhimagga*, Vol. I, p. 20. '*Cetiyapabbatavāsī Mahā Tissattheroviya Theram .. Cetiyapabbatā Anurādhapuram piṇḍācāratthāya ..*'

[6] *Ibid* , Vol I, p. 90: '*dve kira Kulaputtā Anurādhapurā nikkhamitvā anupubbena Thūpārāme pabbajimsu.*'

[7] *Ibid.*, Vol I, p. 96 *Kāraḷiyagirivāsī Nāgatthero .. bhikkhūnaṃ Dhātukatham uddisi.*

[8] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 96: *Mahāvihāre pi Tipiṭaka Cūḷābhayatthero nāma Aṭṭhakathaṃ anuggahetvā va ...*

[9] *Ibid.*, I, p 292

[10] *Ibid.*, I, p. 91.

pabbata. Māra tried in vain to spoil the festival.[1] He makes mention of the *thera* named Cittagutta several times in the *Visuddhimagga.*[2]

In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* he speaks of the Cetiyaghara of the Thūpārāma and also of the great shrine in the Mahāvihāra of Laṅkā.[3] He refers to two thieves of Tambapaṇṇi named Abhaya and Nāga.[4] At the time of the Buddha the monks belonging to the other side of the Ganges assembled at Lohapāsāda in the island of Ceylon.[5] Buddhaghosa mentions Jambukola as a seaport in the north of Ceylon.[6] He refers to a Thera named Tissa of the Leṇagiri or Loṇagiri vihāra in Ceylon. Once five hundred monks on their way to Nāgadīpa reached Girigāma. They did not receive any alms there. When Tissa was informed of this, he went to the village and soon came back with his bowl full of alms. He gave them to the five hundred monks and kept something for him. He when asked as to how he could get alms replied that on account of his practising *sāraṇīyadhamma* his bowl was never empty.[7]

Buddhaghosa mentions Ambalaṭṭhikā situated to the east of the Lohapāsāda.[8] He refers to a slab of stone like a seven-storied pinnacled house in the Lohapāsāda.[9]

A *thera* of Ceylon named Citta is said to have entered the Order in his old age. He fell in love with the young and beautiful queen named Damiḷadevī of a Nāga king named Mahādāṭhika. He refused to believe the death-news of Damiḷadevī. He behaved like a mad man while she was engaged in worshipping at Ambatthala at Cetiyagiri.[10] A *thera* named Milakkhatissa acquired great merit after ordination. He used to meditate with a wet blanket round his head and his feet in water.[11] A *thera* named Tissa belonging to the Cittalapabbata was very much troubled by lustful thoughts. As advised by his teacher, he built a cell and passed one night there. On that very night he became an arahat after great exertion.[12]

Mahādāṭhika, a king of Ceylon, is said to have built a big tope at Ambatthala in the Cetiyagiri mountain and dedicated it to the congregation of monks after performing a grand worship in the form of the Giribhaṇḍavāhana.[13]

---

1 *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, II, p. 376
2 *Ibid*., I, 38, 171, 173.
3 *Ibid*., II, p. 611.
4 *Ibid*., II, 433.
5 *Ibid*., II, 581.
6 *Ibid*., II, 695.
7 *Ibid*., II, p. 534.
8 *Ibid*., II, p. 635
9 *Ibid*., II, p. 678.
10 *Manorathapūraṇī*, pp. 22-23.
11 *Ibid*., pp. 35 foll.
12 *Ibid*., pp. 44-45.
13 *Ibid*., I, p. 22.

Buddhaghosa refers to a village named Uttaragāma in Ceylon containing 100 families.[1] He mentions a monastery in Ceylon named Kāraḷiyagiri where the monks were taught in the *Dhātukathā*.[2] King Kuṭikaṇṇa Abhaya who was a supporter of the nuns, is said to have a horse of the Ājānīya race called Guḷavaṇṇa.[3] He speaks of a monastery in Rohaṇa where a novice used to live and was in the habit of getting two ladles of rice at the house of a Lambakaṇṇa.[4] He refers to a cave called Kuraṇḍaka in Ceylon. This cave contained beautiful paintings of the renunciation of seven Buddhas. There was a big Nāga tree at the entrance to this cave.[5] A secluded bathing place known as the Kuruvakatittha in a large tank existed near the Cittalapabbata Vihāra in Ceylon.[6] The wife of a chief householder in Kotalavāpigāma, a village in Ceylon, was arrested by the king's tax-gatherers under the impression that she was a serving woman.[7] In a monastery in Ceylon named Khaṇḍacela, an Elder was bitten by a snake but he got rid of it by means of meditation.[8]

Buddhaghosa describes the Dīghavāpi, a tank in Ceylon, as extended 9 leagues from Tissamahārāma.[9] King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya killed 32 Damiḷa kings. His coronation took place at Anurādhapura.[10]

Buddhaghosa refers to a monastery known as the Paṅguravihāra in Hatthibhogajanapada in the south of Ceylon. In its front there stood a *pangura* tree. One day the presiding deity of the tree heard a novice reciting the *Mahādhammasamādāna Sutta* and spoke highly of the recital.[11] The *Samantapāsādikā* refers to the efficacy of the medicines suggested by Mahāpaduma *thera* in curing the illness of the queen of king Vasabha of Ceylon.[12]

The Kukkuṭagiri finds mention as a place in Ceylon. It was so called because it was here that Saddhātissa's attendant named Tissa refused to kill some pheasants and set them free at the risk of losing his own life.[13]

Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga* refers to a *thera* named Dhammadinna who was an inhabitant of Taḷaṅgara

---

[1] *Majjhima Nikāya Commentary* (Sinhalese Ed), II, p 978

[2] *Visuddhimagga*, I, p. 96.

[3] *Samyutta Commentary*, I, 27, *P.T S.* Ed., I, p 34, *Majjhima Commentary*, II, p 654

[4] *Anguttara Commentary*, I, p 262

[5] *Visuddhimagga*, I, pp. 38ff

[6] *Majjhima Commentary* (Sinhalese Ed), II, p 1025.

[7] *Vibhanga-aṭṭhakathā*, Sinhalese Ed , p 441

[8] *Majjhima Commentary*, I, p 65.

[9] *Manorathapūraṇī*, I (Sin Ed), p. 386.

[10] *Sumangalavilāsini*, II, p 640.

[11] *Papañcasūdani*, Sinhalese Ed., I, pp. 530ff.

[12] II, p. 471.

[13] *Sāratthappakāsini* (Sinhalese Ed), III, p. 50

in Tambapaṇṇidīpa. In his sermon he used to point out to his audience sufferings in hell and blissful state in heaven.[1] There is a mention of another *thera* of Ceylon named Tissadatta in the same work.[2] Buddhaghosa mentions many other *theras* of Ceylon named Cūḷasamudda, Duttābhaya,[3] Cūḷasiva, Revata, Mahādhammarakkhita and Buddharakkhita. Cūḷasamudda *thera* was approached by five hundred monks when Ceylon was terribly suffering from famine. He was endowed with miraculous power and he helped them to reach the place where alms were easily available.[4] Cūḷasiva *thera* went to Jambudīpa.[5] Revata *thera* used to live in the Malaya country of Ceylon.[6] Mahādhammarakkhita belonged to the Tulādhāravihāra at Rohaṇa. He was very learned and he died while preaching at the Lohapāsāda.[7] Buddharakkhita *thera* was endowed with miraculous power and he saved the life of a Nāga king by exercising this power.[8]

6. *Last days*: Regarding the last days of Buddhaghosa's life the *Mahāvaṃsa supplement* has nothing more to say than this that he, after finishing all his duties in Ceylon, returned to Jambudvīpa to worship the Great Bo-tree, that is to say, or his native place, Bodhgayā in India. As to what he did aftte his return to India besides the worship of the Bo-tree, we are kept entirely in the dark. The *Buddhaghosuppatti*, too, has hardly anything more to add. It simply records that on his return from Ceylon, Buddhaghosa went, first of all, to his preceptor to tell him all that he had done while in Ceylon, and thereafter returned home to see his parents. The last days of his life he passed in retirement from his literary activity, observing the precepts, and passing away peacefully to be reborn in the heaven of Tuṣita. It is said that his dead body was cremated in a funeral pyre constructed of sandal-wood, while his bodily remains were deposited in the *stūpas* erected near the Bo-tree by the people of the locality. The suggestion in both the accounts is that he spent the remaining days of his life at Bodhgayā where he breathed his last. No inscription has come to light from any of the memorial mounds erected within the precincts of the Bo-tree to confirm the truth in the tradition about the erection of the *stūpas* over his bodily remains at the sacred spot of the Mahābodhi.

The *Buddhaghosuppatti* records a tradition of the testing of Buddhaghosa's knowledge of Sanskrit on the eve of his departure from Ceylon. It preserves even a specimen of the Sanskrit verses he was able to compose *impromptu*.

---

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī* (Siṃhalese Ed.), II. p. 392. [2] *Visuddhimagga*, II, p. 403.
[4] *Ibid.*, I, p 103. [4] *Ibid.*, II, p. 403 [5] *Ibid.*, I, p. 170.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, p. 95. [7] *Ibid.*, I, p 96 [8] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 154 foll.

Whether he wrote any work in Sanskrit or not is more than what we can say. According to the *Sāsanavaṃsa*, the great Buddhaghosa wrote, over and above the *Visuddhimagga* and *Piṭaka Commentaries*, a work by the name of the *Piṭakattayalakkhaṇa*, while a Sanskrit kāvya on the life of the Buddha, attributed to Buddhaghosa and entitled *Padyacūḍāmaṇi*,[1] has been found out in South India and published by the order of the Government of Madras. There is nothing in the body of the work itself to show who its author was, save and except a few words of usual modesty in the second and third stanzas of canto I. Judged by its style, the kāvya was a production of a somewhat later age, an age later even than that of Kālidāsa. If a Buddhaghosa were its composer, he must have been a later namesake of the great Pāli scholiast who was the famous author of the *Visuddhimagga*.

Buddhaghosa, whom Burmese tradition associates with a mission to Lower Burma, is evidently a later namesake of the pioneer Pāli commentator, especially when he is represented as the Thera who took a copy of Kaccāyana's Pāli grammar for translation into Burmese and himself wrote a commentary thereon. The history of the introduction of Theravāda Buddhism into Lower Burma is obscure.

---

[1] Ed by M Ranga Āchārya, M A., and S. Kuppuswami Śāstrī, M.A , with a commentary by Paṇḍits K Venkatesvara Śāstrī and D S Satakopa Āchārya, published by the Government of Madras For a detailed account, *vide* B C Law, *The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa*, pp 85–91.

CHAPTER III

PREDECESSORS

The question of Buddhaghosa's predecessors is primarily the question of the origin and development of the *Aṭṭhakathās* or commentaries on the *Three Piṭakas*. As regards both, Buddhaghosa in the prologues to the commentaries written by him invariably tells us that the *Aṭṭhakathās*, which were rehearsed at the First Buddhist Council by the leading Theras of the past headed by Mahākassapa and rehearsed subsequently at the later Councils, were taken to Ceylon and translated into Sinhalese by the Thera Mahinda. These were handed down through the succession of teachers representing the line of Mahinda's pupils. Buddhaghosa based his commentaries on the commentatorial tradition as developed and cherished in the school of Mahâvihāra.[1]

The accounts of the first three Councils are silent altogether on the subject of rehearsal of the *Aṭṭhakathās*. It is for the first time in the account of the Buddhist Council held in Ceylon during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi Abhaya that we have mention of the *Aṭṭhakathās* along with the canonical texts. But it is undeniable that Buddhaghosa's statement as to that is substantially correct in the sense that there is a trace of the commentary process within the canonical texts.

Besides the succession of teachers from the days of Sāriputta, Upāli, Ānanda and Mahākassapa, and in Ceylon from the time of Mahinda, all of whom were in one sense or another the illustrious predecessors of Buddhaghosa, we have mention of the *Porāṇas*, the *Bhāṇakas*, the *Tepiṭaka Theras*, the *Aṭṭhakathācariyas* and the Thera Nāgasena representing the putative author of the *Milinda-Pañho*. Other authorities cited in and presupposed by Buddhaghosa's works consist of the *Peṭaka*, meaning the *Peṭakopadesa*, certain extra-canonical Suttas, the Sinhalese commentaries and the *Andhaka*

---

[1] *Atthasālini*, pp 1-2

Yā Mahākassapādīhi vasīh'aṭṭhakathā purā |
sangītā anusangītā pacchā pi ca isihi yā ||
Ābhatā pana therena Mahindena tam uttamam |
yā dīpam dīpavāsinam bhāsāya abhisankhatā ||
Apanetvā tato bhāsam Tambapanninivāsinam |
āropayitvāniddosam bhāsan tantinayānugam |
Nikāyantaraladdhīhi asammissam anākulam ||
Mahāvihāravāsinam dīpayanto vinicchayam |
attham pakāsayissāmi āgamaṭṭhakathāsu pi ||

Aṭṭhakathā. The *Nettippakaraṇa* which is a treatise on textual and exegetical methodology like the *Peṭakopadesa* can be easily counted among the earlier authorities. The views of the sects and schools of thought other than the Theriya or Theravāda have indirectly contributed to the discussions raised here and there over the interpretation of some salient points of the Doctrine and the Discipline.

1. *Porāṇas*: Buddhaghosa speaks of the Porāṇas or Porāṇakattheras in connection with those who learn the Dhamma from their teachers and maintain the views of their teachers. They do not entertain any dogmatic view of their own.[1] They are, according to the *Gandhavaṃsa*, the Theras who took part in the proceedings of the first three Buddhist Councils and were evidently the earliest known contributors to the commentary literature, the Porāṇācariyā being just another name for the Aṭṭhakathācariyā.[2] It is difficult to think with Mrs. Rhys Davids that the Porāṇas represented a consistent school of philosophic thought. Buddhaghosa cites in the name of the Porāṇas certain traditional sayings of legendary or doctrinal character. The only saying which finds its place in a late canonical text[3] like the *Parivāra*[4] is one regarding the line of Vinaya teachers traced from the Thera Mahinda and his four companions. This saying is in the form of verses which may be regarded as the prototype of those in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, and there is every reason to believe that the *Parivāra* was a compilation by a Thera of Ceylon.[5] According to the Ancients, says Buddhaghosa, the Theras named Mahinda, Iṭṭhiya, Uttiya, Sambala and Bhaddasāla came to Ceylon from India and taught the *Vinaya*, the five *Nikāyas* constituting the *Suttapiṭaka* and also the seven books of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*; after them the following teacher arose in succession and made the *Vinaya* known to the island:

'*Tissatthero ca medhāvī Devatthero ca paṇḍito,*
punar eva Sumano medhāvī vinaye ca visārado,
bahussuto Cūlanāgo gajo va duppadhaṃsiyo,
Dhammapālitanāmo ca Rohaṇe sādhupūjito,
tassa sisso mahāpañño Khemanāmo tipeṭakī
dīpe tārakarājā va paññāya atirocatha.
Upatisso ca medhāvī Phussadevo mahākathī,
punar eva Sumano medhāvī Pupphanāmo bahussuto
mahākathī Mahāsīvo piṭake sabbatthakovido,
punar eva Upāli medhāvī vinaye ca visārado,

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, I, p. 99.
[2] *J.P.T.S.*, 1886, pp. 58f.
[3] B. C. Law, *History of Pali Literature*, I.
[4] *Vinaya*, V, p. 3.
[5] Barua, *Ceylon Lectures*, p. 71.

Mahānāgo mahāpañño saddhammavaṃsakovido,
punar eva Abhayo medhāvī piṭake sabbatthakovido,
Tissatthero ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado,
tassa sisso mahāpañño Pupphanāmo bahussuto
sāsanaṃ anurakkhanto Jambudīpe patiṭṭhito.
Cūlābhayo ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado
Tissattthero ca medhāvī saddhammavaṃsakovido
Cūladevo ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado
Sīvatthero ca medhāvī vinaye sabbatthakovido,
ete nāgā mahāpaññā vinayaññū maggakovidā
vinayaṃ dīpe pakāsesuṃ piṭakaṃ Tambapaṇṇiyā'ti.'

None of the other Porāṇa citations in Buddhaghosa's works is traceable in any of the Pāli canonical texts, and the date of the one which is traceable is definitely post-Mahinda. It is, therefore, very doubtful if they are pre-Mahinda in their origin. One peculiarity about them is that they are all in the form of verse, the prototype of which may be traced in the *Gāthās* attributed to the Theras and Therīs of old.[1]

Just as a tiger, says Buddhaghosa, pounces upon beasts of prey, hiding itself in the jungle, so the monks live in the world, practise meditation and gradually attain the different stages of sanctification. In support of this contention of Buddhaghosa, the Ancients said: Just as a leopard kills a beast of prey hiding itself in a bush, so the disciple of the Buddha retires to the jungle, meditates upon the *kammaṭṭhānas* and attains perfection.[2] According to the Ancients, extreme passion arises in any angry and heated body; but in a quiet and tranquil body serenity exists in the mind.[3] Buddhaghosa quotes the authority of the Ancients while explaining the dependent origination. According to them the birth of a child is true, so is the mode of causes but difficult is the realization of the four noble truths and still more difficult is the teaching of these truths.[4] The Ancients

---

[1] Cf the Buddhist creed formula in the verse of Assaji
Ye dhammā hetuppabhavā hetu tesam Tathāgato āha
tesañ ca yo nirodho—evamvādī mahāsamano
Also the puggala verse of the sister Vajirā·
Yathā hi angasambhārā hoti saddo ratha iti,
evam khandhesu santesu hoti satto 'ti sammuti

[2] *Visuddhimagga*, I, p 270, cf. *Papañcasūdanī*, p 248.
Yathā pi dīpiko nāma nilīyitvā ganhati mige,
tath' evāyam Buddhaputto yuttayogo vipassako
araññam pavisitvāna ganhāti phalam uttamanti.

[3] *Ibid*, I, p. 275
Sāraddhe kāye citte ca adhimattam pavattati
asāraddhamhi kāyamhi sukhumam sampavattatī ti.

[4] *Ibid*, II, p. 522.
Saccam satto patisandhi paccayākāram eva ca
duddasā caturo dhammā desetuñ ca sudukkarā ti.

said, 'In this world exist name and form. Here exists no being nor any man. It is void and made like a machine, an accumulation of suffering, like grass and sticks. Name and form are mutually dependent. When one breaks up, both of them are consequently destroyed. The five states of contact do not arise from the eye or form or anything behind the two. They are created from a cause, as sound arises when the drum is struck. The five states of contact do not arise from ear or sound or anything behind the two. . . . The five states of contact do not arise from nose or smell or anything behind the two. . . . The five states of contact do not arise from tongue or taste or anything behind the two. They do not arise from the body or touch or anything behind the two. It is not the material form from which the states arise. They are created, depending on a cause, as sound arises when the drum is struck.'[1] The passing of the aged, sustenance, season, karma and matter natural—he views them with insight in detail.[2] The mind is agitated, shakes by faith, illumination, knowledge, bliss, repose, indifference, presentation and uplift, resolve and indifferent adverting desire.[3] Whosoever by understanding has found out these

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, II, pp 595-6
Nāmañ ca rūpañ ca idh'atthi saccato
na h'ettha satto manujo ca vijjati,
suññam idam yantam iv'ābhisankhatam,
dukkhassa puñjo tinakatthasadiso ti
Na cakkhuto jāyare phassapañcamā,
na rūpato no ca ubhinnam antarā,
Hetum paṭicca pabhavanti saṅkhatā,
yathā pi saddo pahaṭāya bheriyā
Na so tato jāyare phassapañcamā,
na saddato no ca ubhinnam antarā
Na ghānato jāyare phassapañcamā
na gandhato no ca ubhinnam antarā
na jivhato jāyare phassapañcamā
na rasato no ca ubhinnam antarā
Na kāyato jāyare phassapañcamā,
na phassato no ca ubhinnam antarā
Na vatthurūpā pabhavanti sankhatā
na cā pi dhammāyatane hi niggatā,
Hetum paticca pabhavanti sankhatā,
yathā pi saddo pahaṭāya bheriyā ti

[2] *Ibid.*, II, p 618
Ādānanikkhepanato vayo—vuḍḍhatthagāmito,
āhārato ca ututo kammato cāpi cittato,
dhammatārūpato satta vitthārena vipassati ti

[3] *Ibid*, II, 637
Obhāse ceva ñāne ca pītiyā ca vikampati,
passaddhiyā sukhe ceva yehi cittam pavedhaṭi,
Adhimokkhe ca paggāhe upaṭṭhāne ca kampati
Upekkhāvajjanāya ca upekkhāya nikantiyā ti

ten points is skilful in regard to states and is not unsteady in mind'.[1]

The Porāṇas said, 'Morality is the ornament of a mendicant, it decorates him, being bedecked with morality the mendicant becomes prominent'.[2]

In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* Buddhaghosa refers to the verses uttered by the Porāṇas, the purpose of which is this. Just as a bull moves, immediately after its birth, to and fro, on the face of the earth, so Gotama measured seven powerful steps on the earth immediately after his birth. Moving seven steps Gotama looked all round him. Then he forcefully uttered words which were characterized by and pregnant with eight parts like a roaring lion taking its stand on the summit of a mountain.[3]

The word '*Bhagavā*' is the best of all words, it is the chiefest of all. He is known as the Blessed One who is lucky, fortunate and prosperous. His birth in this world has come to an end and he is not to return to this world any more.[4]

There are ten species of elephants, e.g. Kāḷavaka, Gaṅgeyya, Paṇḍava, Tamba, Piṅgala, Gandha, Mangala, Hema, Uposatha and Chaddanta.[5]

According to the Porāṇas you should practise meditation relating to the attainment of the Path; there are many advantages in this practice which causes emotion in a man. Being unattached to those which bind a man in this world you should strive hard (to attain perfection) with rapt attention.[6]

The body of a man becomes as stiff as a log of wood when bitten by a wooden-mouthed snake (*kaṭṭha-mukhena*).

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, p 638
Imāni dasa ṭhānāni paññā yassa pariciṭā,
Dhammuddhaccakusalo hoti na ca vikkhepam gacchatī ti

[2] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p 55
'*Sīlam yogiss'alankāro, Sīlam yogissa mandanam,*
Sīleh' alaṅkato yogī, maṇḍane aggatam gato ti

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 61
Muhuttajāto va gavampatī yathā
Samehi pādehi phusī Vasundharam
So vikkami satta padāni Gotamo
Setañ ca chattam anudhārayum marū.
Gantvāna so satta padāni Gotamo
Disvā viloki samā-samantato
Aṭṭhangupetam giram abbhudīrayi
Sīhoyathā pabbata-muddhaniṭṭhitoti

[4] *Ibid*, I, 34; cf. *Visuddhimagga* (*P T S.*), p 209; *Samantapāsādikā*, p 62.
'*Bhagavā ti vacanam seṭṭham, Bhagavāti vacanam Uttamam,*
Garu-gārava-yutto so Bhagavā tena vuccatīti.'

[5] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p. 43

[6] *Ibid.*, II, p 400

When the earth-element (*paṭhavī-dhātu*) in a man becomes agitated, it becomes as stiff as if bitten by a wooden-mouthed serpent. A body, when bitten by a putrid-mouthed snake (*pūti-mukhena*), becomes rotten. When the water element in the body becomes agitated, it becomes as putrid as if bitten by a putrid-mouthed snake. When bitten by a fire-mouthed snake (*aggi-mukhena*), a body becomes heated. When the element of fire in a body becomes affected, it becomes as hot as if bitten by a fire-mouthed snake. When bitten by a weapon-mouthed snake (*sattha-mukhena*) the body of a man becomes cut and bruised. When the air element in the body becomes perturbed, it becomes bruised as if bitten by a weapon-mouthed snake.[1]

Going to the circular hall (*maṇḍala-māla*) where the bhikkhus assembled, the Buddha who moved with the powerful steps of an elephant sat down on a beautiful seat (which was particularly meant for him), making all sides round him resplendent. Sitting there the Conqueror, the God of the gods, who was possessed of hundreds of auspicious marks, was shining like a gold coin (*suvaṇṇa-nekkha*) which was kept on a light red blanket. The Buddha in that seat was looking as bright as a *jambonada* coin kept on a red blanket, like the stainless *verocana* jewel, like a great sāla tree in full blossom, like king Neru in his best apparel, like the golden sacrificial post (*suvaṇṇa-yūpa*), like the red kokāsaka lotus, like the bonfire on the top of a mountain, and like the heavenly pāricchatta tree in full blossom.[2]

---

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, p 13
'Patthaddho bhavati kāyo daṭṭho kaṭṭha-mukhena vā,
Paṭhavī-dhātu-ppakopena hoti kaṭṭha-mukhe'va so.
Pūtiko bhavati kāyo daṭṭho pūti-mukhena vā,
Āpo-dhātu-ppakopena hoti pūti-mukhe'va so
Santatto bhavati kāyo daṭṭho aggi-mukhena vā,
Tejodhātūppakopena hoti aggimukhe'va so
Sañchinno bhavati kāyo daṭṭho sattha-mukhena vā,
Vāyodhātu-ppakopena hoti sattha-mukhe'va so ti'

[2] *Ibid*, III, p. 50
'Gantvāna mandala-mālam nāga-vikkanta-cārano
Obhāsayanto lokaggo nisīdi varamāsane
Tahim nisinno nara-damma-sārathī
Devātidevo sata-puñña-lakkhano
Buddhāsane majjha-gato virocati
suvaṇṇa nekkham viya paṇḍu-kambale
Nekkham jambonadass'eva nikkhittam pandu-kambale
Virocati vītamalo maṇi Verocano yathā
Mahāsālo'va samphullo Neru-rājā'v'ālamkato
suvaṇṇa-yupa-sankāso padumo kokāsako yathā,
Jalanto dīpa-rukkho'va pabbat'agge yathā sikhī
Devānam pāricchatto'va sabbaphullo virocathāti'

Residing in the royal house of the Vedisagiri mountain for long thirty nights, the thera (Mahinda) realized that the time for proceeding to the island of Ceylon had come. He arose in the sky with his associates and got down on the Missaka mountain.[1]

The Ancients said: a wise man holds and accepts a thing after he has thoroughly known the following facts, namely, the occasion, the time, the place, the price and the use.[2] Just as a man should bind a calf to a post in order to tame it, so a man should make his mind firm in the faculty of mindfulness.[3]

According to the Ancients, there is no doer of an action, no one realizes the result of an action; one who realizes that the pure *dhamma* exists gets the right understanding.

Thus when both the effort and the result are pregnant with causes a man cannot understand the beginning of either the seed or its resultant, the tree.

As a heretic does not understand what is going to take place in the future, he becomes dependent (on one who knows what is to take place in future). Those who hold heretical views like the *Sassatavāda*, etc., are the heretics who adopt the sixty-two conflicting views. Those who plunge into the stream of passion cannot be free from suffering. Thus a bhikkhu, a disciple of the Buddha, knowing all these realizes the true nature of the *paccayas* which are profound and subtle.[4]

2. *Bhāṇakas*: The function of the Bhānakas was to preserve and transmit the canonical texts by an oral tradition. These texts were being handed down by this method from teacher to teacher (*ācariya-paramparāya*) until they were committed to writing in Ceylon during the reign of Vaṭṭa-gāmaṇi and in India during the reign of Kaniṣka. In the days when writing was not utilized for recording literature the service of the reciters of the texts was not only useful but indispensable. Buddhaghosa in the general introduction to his *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, connects the origin of the different schools of the Bhāṇakas with the First Buddhist Council. We are told that as soon as the Vinaya Texts were recited by Upāli, the president Mahākassapa entrusted him with the task of preserving them by chanting among his adherents. Similarly the task of chanting the *Dīgha Nikāya* was entrusted to Ānanda and his adherents, that of chanting the *Majjhima Nikāya* to the adherents of the school of Sāriputta, that of

---

[1] *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 71.
[2] *Ibid.*, II, p. 305.
[3] *Ibid.*, II, p. 406.
[4] *Visuddhimagga*, II, pp. 602-603

chanting the *Aṅguttara* to the adherents of Anuruddha, while that of chanting the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* was kept in his own custody.[1]

Among the votive inscriptions on the outer railings of the Stūpas of Bharhut and Sāñcī, there are several in which the monk donors are expressly represented as being the Bhāṇakas. Here we have mention also of the monks as being those well versed in the five Nikāyas, from which it may be easily inferred that there were the Bhāṇakas or Reciters of the five Nikāyas, while the *Milinda*[2] includes the *Dīgha-bhāṇakas*, the *Majjhima-bhāṇakas*, the *Saṃyutta-bhāṇakas*, the *Aṅguttara-bhāṇakas*, the *Khuddaka-bhāṇakas* and the *Jataka-bhāṇakas* among the citizens of the Buddha's Dhammanagara.[3] Similarly, the *Atthasālinī* (p. 18) makes mention of the *Dhammapada-bhānakas*.

These Bhāṇakas 'who were originally but different schools of reciters of the canonical texts, developed in Ceylon also into different schools of interpretation and opinion'.[4]

There were three classes of reciters[5]: *Dīgha-bhāṇaka* (reciters of the *Dīgha*), *Majjhima-bhāṇaka* (reciters of the *Majjhima*) and *Saṃyutta-bhāṇaka* (reciters of the *Saṃyutta*). They were adepts in explaining higher knowledge[6] and subjects for recollection.[7] The explanations given by the *Majjhima* reciters differ from those of the *Dīgha* and *Saṃyutta* reciters.[8] According to the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* the *Majjhima-bhāṇakas* counted fifteen books as belonging to the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, while the *Dīgha-bhāṇakas* recognized just twelve books to the exclusion of the *Khuddakapāṭha*, the *Buddhavaṃsa*, the *Cariyā-piṭaka* and the *Apadāna*.[9]

The *Visuddhimagga*[10] mentions Abhayatthera as a *Dīgha-bhāṇaka*, Revatthera as a *Majjhima-bhāṇaka* and Cūḷa-Sivatthera as a *Saṃyutta-bhāṇaka*. Once an Elder was bound with *pūti* creepers and caused to lie down by thieves in Tambapanni island. And when a jungle fire came on he established insight before the creepers could be cut, and died in the extinction of his corruptions. The Elder Abhaya, a reciter of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, coming with five hundred brethren saw and cremated the Elder's body and had a shrine built.[11]

---

1 *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, pp. 13, 15
2 *Milinda*, pp 341ff.
3 Barua and Sinha, *Barhut Inscriptions*, *sub voce*, *Bhānaka*.
4 B. C Law, *The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa*, p. 62
5 *Visuddhimagga*, *P.T S*, p 275
6 *Ibid.*, p 431.
7 *Ibid.*, pp 275 and 286
8 *Ibid.*, pp 275, 286 and 431.
9 *Sumangalavilāsinī*, I, p 15, B. C. Law, *History of Pāli Literature*, I.
10 Pp. 36, 95 and 313
11 *Visuddhimagga*, p. 36—'*Dīgha-bhānaka-Abhayatthero pañcahi bhikkhusatehi saddhim āgacchanto disvā therassa sarīram jhāpetvā cetiyam kārāpesi.*'

At the suggestion of the Tipiṭaka-Cūḷābhaya, an Elder of the Mahāvihāra, Abhaya thera crossed the Gaṅgā and came to the Rohaṇa district in mount Tulādhāra monastery where the Elder Mahādhammarakkhita used to dwell. Here Abhaya recited the *Dīgha Nikāya* at night and during the daytime Mahādhammarakkhita thera explained it to him. After the discourse was over, Abhayatthera became a stream-winner and gave Mahādhammarakkhita thera a subject of meditation.[1]

Thera Reva the reciter of the *Majjhima* came to the Elder Reva, a resident of Malaya, who gave him a subject of meditation. He attained saintship after twenty years during which period he did not look at the scriptures and found that he had not forgotten them.[2]

The Elder Cūḷasiva, repeater of the *Saṃyutta*, acquired immunity from the action of poison in his body on account of his cherishing compassion.[3]

3. *Aṭṭhakathācariyas*: As their name implies, they were a class of teachers, literally 'the commentary teachers', whose views were held as authoritative in the matter of interpretation of doctrinal points. In the *Atthasālinī*, for instance, we are told that according to them, 'An act done with a needle is called a needlework, . . . an act done by an individual is similarly called an individual work. The individual and the work done by an individual are mutually settled. A bodily act is called an act done by body. The body and the bodily act are mutually settled.'[4]

The following views are ascribed to them in the *Sāratthappakāsinī*:

(i) A human body when bitten by a wood-mouthed snake becomes stiff like a log of wood; just so when the element of earth becomes agitated, the body becomes stiff as if bitten by a wood-mouthed snake. Similarly a body, when bitten by a foul-mouthed snake, becomes putrid; even so when the element of water in a body becomes perturbed, it becomes putrid as if bitten by a foul-mouthed snake, etc.[5]

(ii) The *Bojjhaṅga* is so called because it is a constituent of enlightenment.[6]

(iii) Sāvatthī was so called because everything was available there. It was also a meeting place of caravans. The merchants who assembled there asked each other about

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, *P.T.S.*, pp. 96-97.
[2] *Ibid*, p 95
[3] *Ibid*, p 313
[4] *Atthasālinī*, p 86
[5] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, p. 13.
[6] *Ibid.*, III, p 138

the articles they possessed and the reply was 'everything is here'.[1]

(iv) During the time of king Mandhātā, the inhabitants of the three islands knowing that the Jambudīpa was very beautiful and the abode of great men like Buddhas, Paccekabuddhas, senior disciples and paramount kings and sovereigns, went to that island headed by the king. In course of time the king became disgusted with the life there. He was informed of the splendour of the *deva*-world by his ministers. He first went to the Cātummahārājika heaven. Living there for some time he went to the Tāvatiṃsa abode where Sakka welcomed him and gave him half his kingdom. The king, as soon as he reached the Tāvatiṃsa abode, lost his human temperament and received that of the gods. In course of time Mandhātā's craving so much increased that he wished to become the sole ruler of the Tāvatimsa heaven by killing Sakka. Because of his greed his heavenly power faded out and he fell down from his heavenly mansion into his own park and died.

The lands were thus distributed in the Jambudīpa. Those who came there from Pubba-Videha called their land *Videharattha*, those from Aparagoyāna named it as *Aparantajanapada*, and those who hailed from Uttarakuru made their land known as *Kururaṭṭha.*[2]

The Atthakathācariya is apparently a vague term for referring the agreed opinions (*ācariyānaṃ samānaṭṭhakathā*) indefinitely to the Theras connected with the commentary tradition of Ceylon,—the scholastic method of interpreting the *Buddhavacana* as well as the tenets of Buddhism. In other words, the tradition of this class of teachers is really the tradition of the earlier commentaries in Sinhalese which Buddhaghosa undertook to present in a critical Pāli garb.

4. *Earlier Aṭṭhakathās*: We have seen that according to Dhammakitti's account in the *Cūḷavaṃsa*, when the Indian teacher of Buddhaghosa directed him to proceed to Ceylon, he did so by observing that the island of Ceylon was then the proper place for writing a commentary, inasmuch as the authoritative aṭṭhakathās were all in Sinhalese. These earlier commentaries are catalogued thus by Mrs. Rhys Davids:

'(1) The commentary of the dwellers in the North Minster—the Uttaravihāra at Anurādhapura.

(2) The *Mūla* or *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā*, or simply the Aṭṭhakathā of the dwellers in the Great Minster—the Mahāvihāra also at Anurādhapura.

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p 59—*Sabbam ettha atthi.*
[2] *Sumangalavilāsinī*, *P.T S*, pp 481–482.

(3) The *Andha-aṭṭhakathā*, handed down at Kāñcīpura (Conjeeveram) in South India.
(4) The *Mahāpaccari* or Great Raft, said to be so called from its having been composed on a raft somewhere in Ceylon.
(5) The *Kurunda-aṭṭhakathā* so called because it was composed at the Kurundaveḷu Vihāra in Ceylon.
(6) The *Saṅkhepa-aṭṭhakathā* or short commentary, which, as being mentioned together with the Andha commentary, may possibly be also South Indian.'[1]

It is only in the Vinaya commentary, *Samantapāsādikā*, that the Mahāpaccari, Mahākurundiya and Andhaka aṭṭhakathās are quoted by name and discussed, from which fact we may reasonably presume that they were chiefly concerned with the interpretation of the Vinaya rules.[2]

The *Visuddhimagga* refers indeed to an earlier *Vinaya-atthakathā* in Sinhalese, but from this fact alone it cannot be concluded that the Mahākurundiya and Mahāpaccari commentaries quoted and discussed in Sinhalese were then in existence. All that seems most probable and may be asserted with certainty is that the *Āgamaṭṭhakathā* on which Buddhaghosa's commentaries on the first Four Nikāyas were based and the *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā* on which commentaries on the Abhidhamma books, the *Jātaka*, *Buddhavaṃsa*, *Cariyā Piṭaka* and *Apadāna* were built up, were both parts of the *Mahā-atthakathā*. As a partizan of the Mahāvihāra, the great Buddhaghosa strictly adhered to the commentary tradition of the Great Minster and refuted or discarded the views of the teachers belonging to the rival school of Abhayagiri. The *Dīgha-aṭṭhakathā*, *Majjhima-aṭṭhakathā*, *Saṃyutta-atthakathā* and *Aṅguttara-aṭṭhakathā* quoted by name in the *Visuddhimagga* were obviously the four main divisions of the *Āgamatthakathā*. The *Jātakatthakathā* cited in the *Sumangalavilāsinī* and other commentaries was included in the *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā*. The same remark applies with equal force to Buddhaghosa's commentaries on the Abhidhamma books with the single exception of the *Atthasālinī* which, in its opening verses, refers only to Buddhaghosa's own works, namely, the *Visuddhimagga* and *Āgamaṭṭhakathās*. It is quite possible that the *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā* was just another name of the *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā* as a whole. It appears that this earlier Sinhalese *Aṭṭhakathā* did not contain commentaries on

[1] *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics*, p xxviii.
[2] Cf. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, *sub voce*, *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā*.

all the books of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. But it did contain a *Vinaya commentary*.

5. *Nāgasena*: The views quoted by the great Buddhaghosa in his works in the name of the Thera Nāgasena are really the views contained in the *Milinda-Pañho* which is throughout a dialogue between Nāgasena and king Milinda-Menander. The discussions reported in this highly important and instructive Pāli work are said to have taken place five centuries after the demise of the Buddha, that is to say, in the first century A.D. There is no harm in placing the date of its composition even in the second century A.D. The discussions in it clearly presuppose the controversies in the *Kathāvatthu*, the date of the compilation of which is assigned to the eighteenth year of the reign of Aśoka and to 236 B.C.

6. *Mahākaccāna*: He is the putative author of the two companion treatises, *Netti* and *Peṭakopadesa*, on the textual and exegetical methodology which was developed in Theravāda Buddhism side by side with the *Tantrayukti* in the Kauṭilīya *Arthaśāstra*, the *Suśruta* and other Brāhmanical treatises. Mahākaccāna to whom these two treatises are ascribed was but a namesake of the great Thera Mahākaccāna of old. Of the two treatises, the second is quoted by the name of Peṭaka in the *Samantapāsādikā*. Dhammapāla wrote commentaries on them. The *Netti* counts the desecration of a *stūpa* (*thūpabheda*) among the six most atrocious crimes and heinous sins, while the canonical texts speak only of five such crimes and sins. The desecration of the *stūpas* as a possible occurrence is envisaged by the inscriptions on the gateways of the Buddhist *stūpas* at Sāñcī, which cannot be dated earlier than the first or second century A.D. The historical connection between the two treatises and the *Milinda* is obscure. But so far as the characterization of the fundamental concepts of Buddhism in Buddhaghosa's works goes, it is evidently based upon the statements found in the treatises ascribed to Mahākaccāna and in the *Milinda-Pañho*. Buddhaghosa has not, however, cited the authority of the two treatises in the name of Mahākaccāna. These two works stand in the same relation to the Theravāda canon as Yāska's *Nirukta* to the *Vedas* and their methodology may be shown to have developed mainly on the lines of the *niddesas* or *vibhaṅgas* attempted by the great Thera Mahākaccāna among the Buddha's immediate disciples. Their methodology is illustrated throughout by the passages now traceable only in the *Sutta Piṭaka*, and their treatment of the subject of the *paccayas* differs materially from that in the *Paṭṭhānas* or text of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*.

7. *Commentary process within the Canon*: The need for an accurate interpretation of the Buddha's words which formed the guiding principle of life and action of the members of the Saṅgha, was felt from the very first, even while the Master was living. Of course, there was at that time the advantage of referring a disputed question for solution to the Master himself and herein we meet with the first stage in the origin of the Buddhist commentaries. All available evidences point to the fact that within a few years of the Buddha's enlightenment, Buddhist headquarters were established in places adjoining many important cities and towns of the time, viz. Benares, Rājagaha, Vesālī, Nālandā, Pāvā, Ujjenī, Campā, Uttara Madhurā, Ulumpā, Sāvatthī and so on. At each of these places there sprang up a community of Bhikkhus under the leadership and guidance of one or other of the famous disciples of the Buddha, such as Mahākassapa, Mahākaccāna, Mahākoṭṭhita, Sāriputta, Moggallāna. Following the rule of the wandering ascetics and teachers, they used to spend the rainy season in a royal pleasure-garden or a monastery, and, thereafter, generally meet together once a year at Rājagaha, Veluvana, Sāvatthī and the like. Friendly interviews among themselves and occasional calls on contemporary sophists, were not unknown. Among these various leaders of the Bhikkhus, some ranked foremost in doctrine, some in discipline, some in analytical exposition, some in ascetic practices, some in story-telling, some in preaching, some in philosophy, some in poetry, and so on.[1] Among the Buddha's immediate disciples, there were men who came of Brahmin families, and who had mastered the Vedas and the whole of the Vedic literature. It may be naturally asked, what were these profoundly learned and thoughtful Bhikkhus doing all the time?

The itinerant teachers of the time wandered about in the country, engaging themselves wherever they stopped in serious discussions on matters relating to religion, philosophy, ethics, morals and polity.[2] Discussions about the interpretation of the abstruse utterances of the great teachers were frequent and the *raison d'être* of the development of the Buddhist literature, particularly of the commentaries, is to be traced in these discussions. There are numerous interesting passages in the Sutta and Vinaya texts that tell us how occasions arose from time to time for the discussion of various

[1] *Vide Etadaggavaggo, Aṅguttara Nikāya*, I, pp. 23 foll.; *Mahāvamsa*, edited by Geiger, '*The Council of Mahākassapa*', Chap. 3, pp. 16ff

[2] *Buddhist India*, p. 141; B. C. Law, *Historical Gleanings*, Chap. II.

topics among the Bhikkhus, or how their peace was disturbed by grave doubts calling for explanations either from the Buddha himself or from his disciples. Whenever an interested sophist spoke vehemently in many ways in dispraise of the Buddha, in dispraise of the Doctrine and in dispraise of the Order,[1] whenever another such sophist misinterpreted the Buddha's opinion,[2] whenever a heated discussion broke out in any contemporary Brotherhood,[3] or whenever a Bhikkhu behaved improperly, the Bhikkhus generally assembled in the pavilion to discuss the subject, or were exhorted by the Buddha or by his disciples to safeguard their interests. It was on one such occasion that the Buddha was led to offer an exposition of the moral precepts known as the *Sīlakkhandha*—'The tract on morality'—lending its name to the first volume of the *Dīgha Nikāya*.[4] On another occasion Potaliputta, the wanderer, called on Samiddhi, and spoke thus: 'According to Samaṇa Gotama, as I actually heard him saying, *Kamma* either by way of deed or by way of speech is no *Kamma* at all, the real *Kamma* being by way of thought or volition only: *mogham kāyakammaṃ, moghaṃ vacikammaṃ, manokammaṃ eva saccaṃ ti; atthi ca sā samāpatti yaṃ samāpattiṃ samāpanno na kiñci vediyatīti.*'

To him thus saying, replied Samiddhi: 'Speak not friend Potaliputta thus, speak not of him in this manner. Please do not misrepresent our teacher's point of view, for that is not good. - He would never have said so.'

'But tell me, friend Samiddhi, what a man will experience as the consequence of his deliberate action by way of thought, word and deed.' 'Pain', was the reply.[5]

When a report of this discussion was submitted to the Buddha, he regretted that the muddleheaded Samiddhi had given such one-sided answer to the second point of the wanderer. The right and complete answer would in that case have been that 'He will experience either pleasure or pain or neither pleasure nor pain.' But as regards Samiddhi's reply to the first point, he had nothing to gainsay.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the wisdom and folly of Samiddhi, yet a young learner, formed the argument of the Buddha's longer analytical exposition of the all-important subject of *Kamma*, which is termed the *Mahā-*

---

[1] *Dīgha Nikāya*, Vol. I, *Brahmajāla Suttanta*, p 1.

[2] *Majjhima Nikāya*, III, pp. 207-8.

[3] *Ibid*, II, *Sāmagāmasutta*, pp 243-4

[4] *Dīgha Nikāya* (*P T S*), Vol I.

[5] The rendering is not literal, though substantially faithful. *Majjhima Nikāya*, Vol. III, pp. 207 foll

kammavibhaṅga,[1] in contradistinction to his shorter exposition, the *Cūḷakamma-vibhaṅga*,[2] which was addressed to a young Brahmin scholar named Subha. Thus it can be established that the *Mahākammavibhaṅga* was the Sutta basis of the Abhidhamma exposition of the *Sikkhāpadavibhaṅga* which is incorporated in the second book of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*.[3] But, as a matter of fact, both these expositions have left their stamp on subsequent exegetical literature as is evidenced by the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the *Atthasālinī*[4] and similar works. Scanning the matter more closely, we can say that Buddhaghosa's exposition of *Kamma* in his *Atthasālinī* is really the meeting place of both.

The *Majjhima Nikāya* contains many other illuminating expositions of the Buddha, notably the *Saḷāyatana Vibhaṅga*,[5] the *Araṇa Vibhaṅga*,[6] the *Dhātu Vibhaṅga*[7] and the *Dakkhiṇā Vibhaṅga*,[8] which have found their proper place in the Abhidhamma literature, supplemented by higher expositions. They have also found their way into the later commentaries including, of course, the works of Buddhaghosa. Then we have from Thera Sāriputta, the chief disciple of the Buddha, an exposition of the four Aryan truths, the *Saccavibhaṅga*,[9] which had found its due place in the second book of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*, where it has been supplemented by a higher exposition (*Abhidhammabhājaniya*). Sāriputta's exposition contains many of the stock-passages, or the older disconnected materials with which the whole of the Piṭaka literature, as we may reasonably suppose, was built up. This piece of independent commentary has been tacked on to the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*, itself a commentary, and it furnishes a point of distinction between the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* in the *Majjhima Nikāya* and the *Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna Sutta* in the *Dīgha Nikāya*.

A complete catechism of important terms and passages of exegetical nature is ascribed to Sāriputta and is familiarly known as the *Saṅgīti Suttanta*[10] of which a Buddhist Sanskrit version exists in Tibetan and Chinese translations under the name of the *Saṅgīti-paryāya Sūtra*. The method of grouping various topics under numerical heads and of explaining by means of simple enumerations invariably followed by Thera

---

1 *Majjhima Nikāya*, III, pp. 207–215
2 *Ibid.*, III, pp. 202–206, *Nettipakarana*, p. 182.
3 *Vibhaṅga*, pp. 285–292.
4 *Atthasālinī*, pp. 64ff.
5 *Majjhima Nikāya*, Vol. III, pp 215–222.
6 *Ibid.*, pp. 230–237.
7 *Ibid.*, pp 237–247
8 *Ibid*, pp. 253–257.
9 *Majjhima Nikāya*, Vol III, pp 248–252
10 *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, pp. 207ff See for references Prof. Takakusu's highly instructive article on the Sarvāstivadins in *J.P.T.S.*, 1905, p. 67.

Sāriputta in the singularly interesting catechism referred to above as also in the Dasuttara Sutta, characterizes two of the older collections, the *Saṃyutta* and the *Aṅguttara*, and certain books of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*, notably the *Puggala Paññatti*, the materials of which were mostly drawn from the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*. This fact alone can bring home to us the nature of Sāriputta's work in connection with the Piṭaka literature. But Sāriputta does not exhaust the list. We have to consider other renowned and profoundly learned disciples of the Buddha, among whom some were women, who in their own way helped forward the process of development of the commentaries. Take, for example, the case of Thera Mahākaccāna who was allowed to enjoy the reputation of one who could give a detailed exposition of what was said by the Buddha in brief. The *Majjhima Nikāya* [1] alone furnishes four examples of Mahākaccāna's exegesis. It is interesting to note that Mahākaccāna seldom indulges in mechanical enumeration and coining of technical terms as Sāriputta did. On the contrary, he confines himself to bring out the inner significance and true philosophical bearing of the Buddha's first principles.

Thera Mahākoṭṭhita was regarded as an authority next to none but the Buddha himself on *Paṭisaṃbhidā* or methodology of the Buddha's analytical system. In the *Majjhima Nikāya* again we meet with his disquisition on the characteristic marks or specific differences of current abstract terms signifying the various elements of experience.[2] The first part of Mahākoṭṭhita's explanation may be said to be the historical foundation of the Lakkhaṇahāra in the *Netti-pakaraṇa*, of some passages of the *Milinda-Pañho* [3] and certain statements in the commentaries of Buddhaghosa [4]; we have similar contributions from Moggallāna, Ānanda, Dhammadinnā and Khemā.

The whole of the *Vinaya Suttavibhaṅga* is nothing but a canonical commentary on the two Pātimokkha codes. Similarly the *Cullaniddesa* is a word for word commentary on the Pārāyaṇa-group of sixteen poems and the *Khaggavisāna Sutta*, while the *Mahāniddesa*, modelled on the earlier exegesis of Mahākaccāna, is a canonical commentary on the Aṭṭhaka group of sixteen poems.

The canonical texts containing the prose exegeses or word for word commentaries are broadly classed as *Veyyā-*

---

[1] Vol. I, pp. 110ff.; Vol. III, pp 194, and 223.

[2] *Pajānāti pajānātīti . . . . tasmā paññavā ti vuccati . . . . Vijānāti vijānātīti . . . . tasmā viññāṇanti vuccati . . . . Majjhima Nikāya* (*P.T.S.*), Vol. I, p. 292.

[3] *Milinda-Pañho* (Trenckner), p. 62.

[4] E.g., *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, pp. 62–65.

karaṇas. The *Abhidhamma* books with the single exception of the *Kathāvatthu* come within the definition of such *Veyyākaraṇas*. In all of them, the *mātikās* or *uddesas* are followed by the *niddesas* or *vibhaṅgas*. So far as the second *Abhidhamma* book is concerned, in most of the chapters each bearing the name of a *vibhaṅga*, we have the Suttanta exegesis (*Suttantabhājaniya*) supplemented by the *Abhidhamma* exegesis (*Abhidhammabhājaniya*), the latter taking us a step further from the Sutta stage of the commentary-process in the canon. The *Kathāvatthu*, which is a book of Buddhist controversies connected with the time of Aśoka, follows a line of development peculiarly of its own. Through the controversies one can watch with interest a critical method of interpretation of various knotty and important points of Buddhism which bristle with historical, theological, philosophical and psychological interests.

Just as the textual and exegetical methodology developed in the *Netti* and *Peṭakopadesa* may be regarded as a further step from the canonical stages of the *niddesas* or *vibhaṅgas*, so the discussions in the *Milinda* seeking to clarify several knotty points of Buddhism may be rightly held as a further step from the controversies in the *Kathāvatthu*. These two lines of the earlier commentary process were found at last in the *Aṭṭhakathās*, each with its singular contribution to the richness of the scholastic method which emerged out of the earlier processes.

Chapter IV

SUCCESSORS

Buddhaghosa is credited by Dhammakitti with having written commentaries on the whole of the Pāli Tripiṭaka. In fact he wrote commentaries on a large portion of the *Three Piṭakas* but not on the whole. Perhaps he found his life too short for the completion of the huge work to which he devoted his life, or perhaps he found his health failing; or, if we are to believe that he did actually return to India, there might have been other obstacles to his work.

The work thus left unfinished was taken up by others who came after him and it will be interesting here to give an account of persons who, following in the footsteps of the great commentator, served to make the Piṭakas easily intelligible to succeeding generations.

Among his successors, the following are noteworthy:—

1. Buddhadatta, the author of the *Vinaya-vinicchaya*, *Uttara-vinicchaya*, *Abhidhammāvatāra*, *Rūpārūpavibhāga*, and *Madhuratthavilāsinī*, which is a commentary on the *Buddhavaṃsa*.

2. Culla-Buddhaghosa, whom the *Gandhavaṃsa* honours as the author of the two works called *Jātattaginidāna* and *Sotattaginidāna*, but who may really be taken to be the author of the *Paramatthajotikā* which is a serial commentary on the *Khuddakapātha*, *Dhammapada*, *Sutta-nipāta* and *Jātaka*.

3. Buddhaghosa III, who is now regarded as the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* and *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*.

4. Dhammapāla, who wrote the *Nettipakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*, *Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā*, *Udāna-aṭṭhakathā*, *Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā*, *Theratherīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā*, *Vimalavilāsinī*, a commentary on the *Vimānavatthu*, *Vimalavilāsinī*, a commentary on the *Petavatthu*, *Paramattha-mañjūsā*, a commentary on the *Visuddhimagga*, *Līnatthapakāsinī*, *Līnatthavaṇṇanā*, etc.

5. Mahānāma, who wrote the *Saddhammapakāsinī*, a commentary on the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*.

6. Upasena, who is known as the author of the *Saddhammapajjotikā* which is a serial commentary on the *Culla-niddesa* and *Mahāniddesa*.

Buddhadatta: His main fame as a writer rests on the fact of his being the composer of the two *Vinaya* and two *Abhidhamma Manuals* in elegant prose or verse, mostly in verse. The *Buddhavaṃsa* is the only canonical text on which

he wrote a commentary worth the name. The two *Vinaya Manuals* and *Abhidhammāvatāra* are mere summaries of the materials derived from the earlier Sinhalese commentaries written by him at the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. There is hardly any evidence of critical scholarship. He was an elder contemporary of the great Buddhaghosa in so far as he went to Ceylon before the latter, and an original writer in so far as he wrote, almost at the same time in South India, independently of the *Visuddhimagga* and other works of the great commentator Buddhaghosa. His second *Abhidhamma Manual* called *Rūpārūpavibhāga* is historically important as being the precursor of Anuruddha's *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha.*

The contemporaneity of Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa, the great commentator, is sought to be established, as we saw, on the basis of their references to a common personality, namely, Thera Saṅghapāla. Arguing on this and other grounds, it seems reasonable to connect their literary activities with the latter part of the reign of Goṭhābhaya-Meghavaṇṇa, or, at the latest, with the reign of Jeṭṭhatissa (A.D. 323–33), the son and successor of king Goṭhābhaya (A.D. 302–15).

The known facts about Buddhadatta may be told in a few words. The thera [1] was a celebrity of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon, and was an inhabitant of the Coḷa Kingdom situated on the Kāverī. He tells us that his royal patron was king Accuta Accutavikkanta of the Kalabbha or Kalamba dynasty. All his works were written in the famous monastery erected by Venhudāsa or Kaṇhadāsa on the banks of the Kāverī.[2]

Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta has published an edition of Buddhadatta's *Abhidhamma* and *Vinaya Manuals*, while his royal Sinhalese edition of the *Buddhavaṃsa Aṭṭhakathā* has been publishod in the Simon Hevāvitaraṇe Series. The *Abhidhammāvatāra* serves as an introduction to the *Abhidhamma* philosophy. Buddhaghosa expounds his psychology in terms of the five *khandhas*. Buddhadatta opens his scheme with a fourfold division of the compendium, viz. mind, mental

[1] According to the *Gandhavamsa*, Buddhadatta came next to Buddhaghosa *J.P.T S.*, 1886, p 59

[2] *Abhidhammāvatāra*, *P.T.S*, Viññāpanaṃ, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi and xvii.

'. . . *Vinayavinicchayo* . .
. . *Colaraṭṭhe Bhūtamaṅgala-gāme*
Venhudāsassa ārāme vasantena
Accutavikkama-nāmassa coḷarañño kāle kato'
'*Kāverī-paṭṭane ramme, nānārāmopasobhite*
Kārite Kanhadāsena dassanīye manorame.' (*Abhidhammāvatāra.*)
'. . . . *Buddhadattenaracito'yaṃ Vinaya-vinicchayo.*'
(*Vinaya-vinicchaya.*)

properties, material quality and *nibbāna*. In this respect Buddhadatta's representation is perhaps better than that of Buddhaghosa.[1]

It is clear that the two writers drew their materials from the same source. This fact well explains why the *Visuddhimagga* and the *Abhidhammāvatāra* have so many points in common. Buddhadatta has rendered great service to the study of the *Abhidhamma* tradition which has survived in Theravāda Buddhism to the present day. The legendary account is that Buddhadatta put in a condensed form that which Buddhaghosa handed on in Pāli from the Sinhalese commentaries. 'But the psychology and philosophy are presented through the prism of a sound and vigorous intellect, under fresh aspects in a style often less discursive and more graphic than that of the great commentator, and with a strikingly rich vocabulary.'

It is also narrated in the account we have referred to above that when on sea Buddhadatta met Buddhaghosa and learnt that he was going to Ceylon to render the Sinhalese commentaries into Pāli. He spoke to the latter thus, 'When you finish the commentaries, please send them to me, so that I may summarize your labours.' Buddhaghosa said that he would comply with his request and the narrative adds that the Pāli commentaries were after completion actually placed in the hands of Buddhadatta who summed up the commentaries on the *Abhidhamma* in the *Abhidhammāvatāra* and those on the *Vinaya* in the *Vinaya-vinicchaya* (abridged translation of the foregoing by the editor, *Buddhadatta's Manual*, p. xix). Mrs. Rhys Davids says, 'It is probably right to conclude that they both were but handing on an analytical formula, which had evolved between their own time and that of the final closing of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*.'[2]

Like Buddhaghosa, Buddhadatta, too, employed the simile of the purblind and the lame to explain the relation between *Nāma* and *Rūpa*.[3] Buddhadatta's division of the terms into *Samūha* and *Asamūha* is another interesting point.[4] It will be remembered that such a division of terms

---

[1] Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Psychology* (*Quest Series*), p 174.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 179
[3] *Abhidhammāvatāra*, *P T.S*, p 115
'*Nāmaṃ nissāya rūpan tu, rūpam nissāya nāmakam*
pavattati sadā sabbam, pañcavokāra-bhūmiyam;
imassa pana atthassa, āvibhāvattham eva ca
jaccandha-pīṭhasappīnam, vattabbā upamā idha.'
[4] *Abhidhammāvatāra*, *P.T.S.*, p. 83.
'*Upādā-paññatti nāma samūhāsamūha-vasena duvidhā hoti.*'

as this was far in advance of the older classification embodied in the *Puggala Paññatti commentary*.[1]

According to Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta,[2] Buddhadatta was either older than Buddhaghosa or of the same age with him.

Culla Buddhaghosa (*Buddhaghosa II*): Buddhaghosa the Great in the prologue to his *Atthasālinī* and the epilogue to his *Sammohavinodanī* says that he undertook to compose these works at the instance of the Bhikkhu or Yati Buddhaghosa, evidently a younger contemporary and fellow inmate of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. The *Gandhavaṃsa* ascribes to a junior Buddhaghosa, Culla Buddhaghosa, the two works called *Jātattaginidāna* and *Sotattaginidāna*, which are obviously Burmese titles for two medical treatises, and if not so, for the Pāli *Jātakaṭṭhakathā* and *Suttaṭṭhakathā*. Even apart from that, the *Vinaya commentary*, *Samantapāsādikā*, clearly presupposes not only the *Visuddhimagga* and other works of Buddhaghosa the Great but also the *Paramatthajotikā*, a serial commentary on the four Sutta texts of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, viz. the *Khuddakapāṭha*, *Dhammapada*, *Sutta-nipāta* and *Jātaka*. When we say 'presupposes' we do not base our statement on the cross-references between the Vinaya and Nikāya commentaries loosely given by the later redactors of them. Here it is based on the indebtedness of the *Samantapāsādikā* to the earlier Pāli commentaries in its treatment of certain common Sutta topics. It goes without saying that the *Visuddhimagga* was the common authority behind them. When the tradition indiscriminately credits the great Buddhaghosa also with the authorship of the *Paramatthajotikā*, there must have been a good reason for it, but that was not certainly the fact that the author of the first Four Nikāya commentaries was the same person as that of the *Paramatthajotikā*.

Let us take, first of all, the *Jātakaṭṭhakathā* or *Jātakatthavaṇṇanā* for consideration. Rhys Davids called our attention to an earlier Jātaka commentary (*Jātakaṭṭhakathā*) in Eḷu or Old Sinhalese, which is presupposed by the present commentary.[3] Nothing could be a better suggestion on the part of Rhys Davids than to opine: 'Our Pāli work may have been based upon it, but cannot be said to be a mere version of it.'[4]

---

[1] Cf. *Puggala-Paññatti Commentary*, *P.T.S.*, p 173

[2] *Buddhadatta's Manual*, edited by Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta, pp. xiii and xiv. '*Ayam pana Buddhadattācariyo Buddhaghosācariyena samānavassiko vā thokam vuḍḍhataro vā ti sallakkhema.*'

[3] The present commentary, as already pointed out by Rhys Davids, refers three times to an earlier *aṭṭhakathā* (Introd., p. lx). See Fausböll, *Jātaka*, I, p 62.

[4] Introd , p. lx.

In this connection I may observe that though it professedly followed the Mahāvihāra method of exposition,[1] the present commentary in Fausboll's edition does not claim to have been based upon any single commentary in Sinhalese. It claims certainly, on the other hand, to have been a critically prepared reliable Pāli version based upon a previous *Jātakaṭṭhakathā* (probably of the Mahāvihāra school) and a few other commentaries, vaguely referred to in the lump by the expression *Sesa-aṭṭhakathāsu* ('in the remaining commentaries').[2]

Now, turning to the introductory verses in the Siamese edition, I find that there was a separate version of the Jātaka commentary which followed with meticulous care the same method of exposition as in the *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā* in Old Sinhalese.[3]

The difference between the two versions is accentuated also by the undermentioned three facts:—

(1) That the *Panāmagāthā* or Introductory verses are quite different in them.
(2) That the titles of the Jātakas vary here and there.
(3) That the order and titles of the last ten Mahājātakas, too, are at variance.

The total number of the Jātakas is, no doubt, the same in both of them; it is 547, falling short of the traditional total of 550 as given by Buddhaghosa and others by three Jātakas.

In the *Paṇāmagāthā* in Fausboll's edition we are told that the work was undertaken at the personal request of three Theras, one of whom, Buddhadeva by name, belonged to the Mahiṃsāsaka sect[4] (*Mahiṃsāsaka-vaṃsamhi sambhūtena*). In the Siamese edition, on the other hand, we read that the work was undertaken in compliance with a repeated request of a number of wise and learned monks.[5] The prologue to the Siamese edition is appropriate to the *Apadāna-aṭṭhakathā*.

[1] Fausboll, *Jāt.*, I, p 1

[2] *Ibid*, I, p 62 *yam pana Jātakaṭṭhakathāyam taṃ sesa-aṭṭhakathāsu n'atthi, tasmā idham eva gahetabbam*

[3] Siamese ed, I, p 2. *Purāna-Sīhalabhāsāya Porānaṭṭhakathāya ca ṭhapitam tam na sādheti sādhūnam icchiticchitam. Tasmā tam upanissāya Porānatthakathānayam vivajjetvā viruddhatthe visesattham pakāsayam visesa-vaṇṇanam seṭṭham karissām'aṭṭhavannanan ti.*

[4] Fausböll, I, p. 1.

[5] Siamese ed., I, p. 1.

'*Dhīrātidhīrehi āgamaññūhi viññūhi*
Apadānaṭṭhakatham, bhante, kātabban ti visesato
Punappunādaren'eva yācito'ham yasassībhi
tasmāham sāpadānassa Apadānassa sesato,' etc.

As for the difference in titles, however immaterial, the following table may suffice to indicate it [1]:—

Fausböll	Siamese
Kuruṅga (21).	*Kuruṅga-miga* (21).
Gagga (155).	*Bhagga* (155).
Telovāda (246).	*Bālovāda* (246).
Kakkaṭa (267).	*Suvaṇṇa-kakkata* (267).
Maccha-Uddāna (288).	*Maccha-dāna* (288).
Bhadra-Ghaṭa (291).	*Bhadra-ghaṭabheda* (291).
Kāya-vicchinda (293).	*Kāya-nibbinda* (293).
Komāya-putta (299).	*Komāriya-putta* (299).
Kassapamandiya (312).	*Kassapanandiya* (312).
Sasa (316).	*Sasapaṇdita* (316).
Ambacora (344).	*Amba* (344).
Dhonasākha (353).	*Venasākha* (353).
Ghata (355).	*Dhaṅka* (355).
Ahiguṇḍika (365).	*Ahituṇḍika* (365).
Nandiyamiga (385).	*Nandiyamigarāja* (385).
Dhajavihetha (391).	*Pabbajita-viheṭhaka* (391).
Bhisapuppha (392).	*Upasinghapuppha* (392).
Vighāsa (393).	*Vighāsāda* (393).
Kāka (395).	*Maṇi* (395).
Sattubhasta (402).	*Senaka* (402).
Kaccāni (417).	*Kaccānigotta* (417).
Cetiya (422).	*Cetiyarāja* (422).
Mahāsuka (429).	*Mahāsuvarāja* (429).
Cullasuka (430).	*Cullasuvakarāja* (430).
Hārita (431).	*Haritaca* (431).
Padakusalamāṇava (432).	*Padakusala* (432).
Samkha (442).	*Saṃkhabrāhmaṇa* (442).
Biḷāri-Kosiya (450).	*Bilāra* (450).
Ghata (454).	*Ghatapaṇdita* (454).
Dhamma (457).	*Dhammadevaputta* (457).
Yuvañjaya (460).	*Yudhañjaya* (460).
Kāliṅga-bodhi (479).	*Kāliṅga* (479).
Sarabha-miga (483).	*Sarabha* (483).
Sivi (499).	*Sivirāja* (499).
Sirimanda (500).	*Sirimeṇḍaka* (500).
Rohanta-miga (501).	*Rohaṇa* (501).

It is neither in Fausböll's nor in typically Ceylonese editions of the present Jātaka commentary but only in the Siamese that I find the recension of the Pāli birth-stories which are elaborately illustrated on the glazed plaques at the

[1] Minor variants are not noticed here.

Ānanda Pagoda in Pagan. With regard to the order and titles of the Jātakas illustrated on the Ānanda Pagoda as compared with those in Fausböll's edition, Duroiselle observes: 'The order of the shorter stories up to No. 537 included strictly follows that of the Pāli Jātaka as edited by Fausböll (Vols. I–V), although the names here and there may slightly differ. But the traditional order of the *Mahānipāta* or the collection of the last ten long stories (Vol. VI of Fausböll) is not quite the same.'[1] This very observation is *mutatis mutandis* applicable to the recension in the Siamese edition with equal force.

Fausboll	Siamese	Ānanda Pagoda[2]
Mūgapakkha[3] (538)	*Temiya*[4] (538)	*Temiya*[5] (538)
Mahājanaka (539)	*Mahājanaka* (539)	*Mahājanaka* (539)
Sāma (540)	*Suvannasāma* (540)	*Suvannasāma*[6] (540)
Nimi (541)	*Nimirāja* (541)	*Nemi* (541)
Khaṇḍahāla (542)	*Candakumāra* (544)	*Candakumāra*[7] (544)
Bhūridatta (543)	*Bhūridatta* (543)	*Bhūridatta* (543)
Mahānāradakassapa (544)	*Brahmanārada* (545)	*Mahābrahmanārada*[8] (545)
Vidhurapaṇḍita (545)	*Vidhura* (546)	(?) *Vidhura* (546)
Mahā-ummagga (546)	*Mahosatha* (542)	*Mahosadha*[9] (542)
Vessantara (547)	*Vessantara* (547)	*Vessantara* (547)

Thus we have two slightly different recensions of the Pāli Jātaka commentary, one mainly based upon the *Mahāvihāra Aṭṭhakathā* and the other upon the *Porāṇa*, and both containing 547 birth-stories in all. I may now proceed to show that there was a third recension of the same fulfilling the traditional total of 550. In the Preface to the *Epigraphia Birmanica*, Vol. II, Pt. I, p. iv, f.n. 1, Duroiselle informs us that the terracotta plaques at the Petleik Pagoda, Pagan, illustrate 550 stories. How this traditional number has been made up cannot be definitely stated until the letterpress which was being written on those plaques is published. In the absence of that, one may at the most indulge in certain surmises, none of which may ultimately come true. It may, with fair certainty, be conjectured that the required number has been made up by adding three Jatakas to or including them in one of the two recensions of 547. The question is: what are these three Jātakas, and what difference will their

---

[1] *Epigraphia Birmanica*, Vol. II, Pt. 1, pp iv-v.

[2] For the list, see *Epigraphia Birmanica*, Vol. II, Pt. 1, p. v, and the whole volume

[3] Bharhut title, *Mugapakaya*.

[4] *Cariyā-Piṭaka* has *Temiya-cariyā* (fourth chapter, *Adhiṭṭhānapāramitā*).

[5] Popular Burmese name, *Temi-zat* (= *Temiya-Jātaka*), *Epigraphia Birmanica*, II, Pt. 1, p. 1.

[6] *Ibid.*, II, Pt. 1, p. 29.

[7] *Ibid.*, II, Pt. 1, p. 76.

[8] *Ibid*, II, Pt. 1, p. 88

[9] *Ibid.*, II, Pt. 1, p. 38. The Talaings, or rather Mōns, call it '*jāt-Mahos*'.

inclusion make to the order of all the Jātakas? The second part of the question cannot be answered now. As regards the first part, out of the three required Jātakas, two may, perhaps, be supplied from the *Cariyā-Piṭaka*, and one from the *Mahāvastu*, the two stories from the former being those of Mahāgovinda[1] and Sacca,[2] and that from the latter the Vṛṣabha-Jātaka,[3] illustrated on the Bharhut railing,[4] or all the three from the *Cariyā-Piṭaka*, viz. those of Mahāgovinda, Sacca, and Mahālomahaṃsa.[5] I say from the *Cariyā-Piṭaka*, because the Pāli *cariyās* were presumably all based upon an earlier collection of the Jātakas.

Besides these three recensions, two of 547 and one of 550 Jātakas, I may even speak of another of 500 birth-stories, which, as a Pāli canonical work, must be regarded as the oldest of all the four. The *Culla-niddesa* gives the total number of Jātakas then known to the Buddhist Community as 500 (*pañcajātakasatāni*).[6] The statement in the *Culla-niddesa* cannot but be construed as referring to a Pāli canonical text containing 500 Jātakas. According to Fā-Hien's itinerary,[7] the Abhayagiri School had a recension which recognized only 500 Jātakas, a total perfectly agreeing with the number in the *Culla-niddesa*.[8] I can say, therefore, that there were from a certain late date two traditional numbers, one maintained by the teachers of Abhayagiri and the other by those of Mahāvihāra.

In the immediate historical and literary background of the Pāli canonical collection of 500 Jātakas are the Suttanta Jātakas, 'the earliest forms' in which we find the Jātakas as distinguished from the fables, parables, legends, and current folk-tales presupposed by them. The *Culla-niddesa*, as already noted, gives just four typical examples of them. Rhys Davids has drawn our attention to some more. Applying the single criterion of concluding identification [9] or the two criteria of narration of the tale by the Buddha and identifica-

---

[1] *Cariyā-Piṭaka*, No 5, *Mahāvastu*, III, p. 197, not included in the scheme of 547.

[2] *Cariyā-Piṭaka*, No. 28, wrongly identified with *Saccaṃkira-Jātaka*. The story is not to be found in Fausböll's *Jātaka* See *Cariyā-Piṭaka commentary*, edited by D. L. Barua for the *P.T.S*, pp. 231–3.

[3] *Mahāvastu*, III, p 28; cf Dharmaruci story *Divyā*, xviii.

[4] Barua, *Barhut*, Bk III, pl. lxxx, 109.

[5] *Calcutta Review*, 1927, p. 57.

[6] *Niddesa*, II, p. 80

[7] Beal, *Records of the Western World*, I, p. lxxv.

[8] *Indian Culture*, Vol. V, No. 2.

[9] Applied by Rhys Davids, *Introd.*, p. xlviii

tion of the narrator with the hero,[1] Rhys Davids' list of Suttanta Jātakas[2] may be modified and presented as below:

(1) Mahāpadāna-story (*D.*, II, p. 1).
(2) Mahā-Sudassana (*D.*, II, p. 169).
(3) Mahā-Govinda (*D.*, II, p. 220).
(4) Makhādeva (*M.*, II, p. 74).
(5) Mahāvijita's Priest (*D.*, I, p. 134).
(6) Ghaṭikāra (*M.*, II, p. 53).
(7) Pacetana's wheelwright (*A.*, I, p. 111).

Considered in the light of the above observations, the position of the Pāli canonical collection of Jātakas is absolutely clear; it contained 500 birth-stories at any rate, so it was known to the compiler of the *Culla-niddesa* in about the third century B.C., if not earlier still. It was virtually the same work that was held to be authoritative among the monks of Abhayagiri monastery in Ceylon as far down as Fā-Hien's visit, if not later still. The metrical text in the present Jātaka commentary is veritably the same as the canonical text without certain remodellings, certain amplifications, certain additions and alterations here and there. The Mahāvihāra School stood for a total of 550 Jātakas, and produced works to justify it. But whether the actual number found is 547 or 550, scholars have convincingly shown that the latter number was derived out of the former only by certain manipulations[3] which, clever or not, are naively mechanical and meaningless in effect.

Even after conceding that the 547 or 550 birth-stories in three recensions of the Pāli Jātaka commentary are thus reducible to 500, or for the matter of that, 500 is the correct number of Jātakas as known to the author of the *Culla-niddesa* and to the monks of Abhayagiri, we should not dismiss the traditional number 550 as altogether unjustifiable. Here the real crux is—where to find the additional 50 Jātakas. The question is not so difficult to answer as at first sight. There are principally these two sources, from either of which the Jātakas may be supplied:

(1) The fifty birth-stories (*Paṇṇāsa-Jātakaṃ*) that are not contained in the present commentary collection of Jātakas but available in Siam in a separate collection.[4]

---

[1] It may be applied evidently on the basis of the statement in the *Culla-niddesa*, II, p 80.
[2] *Buddhist India*, p. 195.
[3] Barua, *Barhut*, Bk. I, pp 90-1 Cf. also Rhys Davids, *Introd*, p lv, f.n. 1
[4] For an account of it, see Leon Feer, *Etude sur les Jātakas*, pp 62–5, 66–71

Or, (2) the Jātakas that are embedded in the Pāli Nikāyas,[1] or related in the *Cariyā-Piṭaka* and its commentary,[2] the *Mahāvastu*,[3] and other works, but not included in the Pāli commentary collection of 547 Jātakas.

Buddhaghosa the Great knew the traditional total number of the Jātakas to be 550. His narration of the Jātakas was evidently based upon the Mahāvihāra recension of the earlier Sinhalese *Jātaka-aṭṭhakathā*. He has utilized a part of the *Jātaka Nidānakathā* in his *Papañcasūdanī*. Here his narration of the Bodhisattva's career in his last birth assumes the form of a summary of what is found in the Jātaka commentary in Fausboll's edition. If the general introduction to the *Atthasālinī* (p. 32) narrates the *durenidāna* of the Jātaka commentary in the same language in which it is presented in Fausböll's edition, it is not difficult to make out that the whole thing is an interpolation and redundant.

Tradition certainly ascribes the extant Jātaka commentary[4] to Buddhaghosa.[5] Rhys Davids pertinently observed: 'If not, however, by Buddhaghosa, the work must have been composed after his time; but probably not long after . . . and had the present work been much later than his time, it would not have been ascribed to Buddhaghosa at all.'[6]

Fortunately there is no paucity of positive internal evidence to urge against the above tradition. Buddhaghosa, as is well known, has narrated several Jātakas, omitting, of course, the concluding portion in his commentaries on the first four Nikāyas, the Vinaya texts, and the Abhidhamma

---

[1] E g *Mahāvijaya's Priest* (*D*, I, p 143), *Mahāgovinda* (*D*, II), *Ghaṭikāra* (*M*, II, p 53), and *Pacetana's Wheelwright* (*A*, I, p. 111). Cf *Buddhist India*, p 196

[2] E g *Saccasavhaya-paṇḍita* (No 28) and *Mahālomahamsa* (No 35) in addition to *Mahāgovinda* (No. 5).

[3] E g *Rakṣita* (*Mahāvastu*, i, p 283), *Hastināga* (i, p 286), *Ṛṣabha* (i, p 288), *Godhā* (ii, p. 64), *Hārapradāna* (ii, p. 67), *Vyāgyrībhūtā Yaśodharā* (ii, p 69), *Siri* (ii, p 89), *Kinnarī* (ii, p. 94), *Mṛga* (ii, p. 234), *Sakunta* (ii, p 241), *Kacchapa* (ii, p 244); *Surūpamṛgarāja* (ii, p. 255), *Anangana* (ii, p 271); *Vṛṣabha* (iii, p. 28), *Vānara* (iii, p 31), *Punyavanta* (iii, p 33), *Vijitāvi* (iii, p 41), *Supātra* (iii, p 215), *Padumāvatī* (iii, p. 155), *Candra-Sūrya* (iii, p. 172); *Gaṅgapāla* (iii, p 191), *Dharmalabdha* (iii, p. 286), (i) *Ājñātakauṇḍinya* (iii, p. 347), (ii) *Ājñātakauṇḍinya* (iii, p 349), *Pañcabhadra-vargīya* (iii, p 303) in addition to *Mahāgovinda* (iii, p. 197).

[4] The title suggested in the opening verses in Fausböll's edition is *Jātakaṭṭhavannanā*, and that in the Siamese edition, *Apadānaṭṭhakathā* (p 1) '*Apadānaṭṭhakathaṁ, bhante, kātabban ti visesato*', also *Apadānassa 'ṭṭhavannanā* (p 2) But the title adopted for the present Siamese edition is *Jātakaṭṭhakathā*.

[5] *Gandhavamsa*, *J P.T S.*, 1886, p. 59

[6] Introduction to *Buddhist Birth-stories*, p. lx

treatises, as also in his *Visuddhimagga*. Now, comparing his narration of a birth-story with that in the present Jātaka commentary, one may easily notice the points of agreement and difference between them. So far as the verses and their explanations go, there is hardly any difference worth noting. The difference mainly lies in the wording and presentation of details. Let one comparison here suffice.

In Buddhaghosa's narration, the Mūlapariyāya Jātaka is commenced with the words: *Bhūtapubbaṃ, bhikkhave, aññataro disāpāmokkho brāhmaṇo Bārāṇasiyaṃ paṭivasati, tiṇṇaṃ Vedānaṃ pāragū*, etc.[1]

The same in the Jātaka commentary begins with the words: *Atīte Bārāṇasiyaṃ Brahmadatte rajjaṃ kārente Bodhisatto brāhmaṇakule nibbattitvā vayappatto tiṇṇaṃ Vedānaṃ pāragū*, etc.[2]

Here the following points may be noted, each of importance:—

(1) That Buddhaghosa adhered to the earlier Sutta phraseology when he introduced the story with the word *bhūtapubbaṃ*.[3]

(2) That he independently narrated it in Pāli on the basis of a Sinhalese version then available to him.

(3) That the verses and their explanations were taken over intact from the Sinhalese work.[4]

(4) That he by his Pāli narrations of the stories had set the example which was certainly 'quickly followed'.[5]

The common authorship of the *Paramatthajotikā* as a serial commentary on the first three books of the *Khuddakanikāya*, viz. the *Khuddakapāṭha*, *Dhammapada* and *Suttanipāta* can be easily established by the identity of the first line of the *paṇāmagāthā* and the two verses at the end. This is evident also from the common method of treatment and style of composition. The commentaries on the *Maṅgala*, *Ratana* and *Metta Sutta* as found in the *Khuddakapāṭha* and *Suttanipāta Aṭṭhakathās* are identical, while those on the *Sela* and *Vāseṭṭha Suttas* as found in the *Majjhima* and *Sutta*-

---

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p 57.

[2] Fausböll, *Jātaka*, No 245

[3] Even where the word *atīte* occurs, the text differs in language from that in the *Jātaka commentary* Cf. *Papañcasūdanī*, III, p. 69, and Fausboll, *Jātaka*, III, p. 376.

[4] This is partially corroborated by the quotations of *gāthās* in the *Milinda-Pañho* from the *Jātakas*.

[5] This was clearly anticipated by Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Birth-stories*, Introd., p. lx.

nipāta Aṭṭhakathās are in many respects different. The *Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā*, considered section by section, appears to be a masterly dissertation, far in advance of the treatment of common topics in the writings of Buddhaghosa the Great. One may compare, for instance, the treatment of the topic of *saraṇa* in the *Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā* with that in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, the section dealing with the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*. The *Dvattiṃsākāravaṇṇanā* in the *Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā* clearly presupposes Buddhaghosa's treatment of the subject in the *Visuddhimagga*. The *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* is in many places referred to in the *Suttanipāta* commentary. The *Paramatthajotikā*, particularly the *Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā*, is presupposed by the *Vinaya commentary*.

In the epilogue to the *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* its author says that he undertook to compose this work while he was residing in a monastery erected for him by a contemporary king of Ceylon deserving the epithet of *Sirikūṭa* of which the two variants are *Sirikuḍḍa* and *Sirigutta*, and that at the request of a Thera named Kassapa. *Sirikūṭa* or *Sirikuḍḍa* is evidently the epithet applied by the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* to the contemporary king of Ceylon in the 20th year of whose reign he began to write this work. Some are in favour of identifying this king of Ceylon with Kitti-Siri-Meghavaṇṇa who was a contemporary of Samudragupta. The author of the *Paramatthajotikā* seems to have been a Thera of Ceylon.

Buddhaghosa III: The tradition indiscriminately credits the great Buddhaghosa also with the authorship of the Vinaya commentaries, viz. the *Samantapāsādikā* and the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*. The second work which is a commentary on the two *Pātimokkhas*, is nothing but an abridged version of the first work in so far as it is a commentary on the *Suttavibhaṅga*. Even if Buddhaghosa was really the author of these two works, his personal identity with Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, has been seriously challenged in recent times.[1] It is worth while to examine carefully all the external as well as the internal evidence on the subject before coming to a definite conclusion.

The arguments hitherto advanced to prove the existence of the two authors of the same name are as follows:—

1. The author of the *Visuddhimagga* tells us that he proceeded with the writing of this great work following the

[1] '*Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa: Their Contemporaneity and Age,*' *The University of Ceylon Review*, Vol. III.

behest of the Most Venerable Saṅghapāla who was then the head of the Mahāvihāra and a leading personality of the same institution in the time of King Goṭhābhaya Meghavaṇṇa, the grandfather of King Kitti-Siri-Meghavaṇṇa, a contemporary of Samudragupta.

2. The author of the *Samantapāsādikā* tells us, on the other hand, that he read the Vinaya commentaries with the Most Venerable Buddhamitta who was then the head of the Mahāvihāra and undertook to compose this great work at the behest of Thera Buddhasiri.

3. It seems that Buddhamitta succeeded to the headship of the Mahāvihāra after the death of Buddhasiri, who was probably the most saintly head of the Mahāvihāra and who died during Fā-Hien's stay in Ceylon.

4. The author of the *Visuddhimagga* mentions no contemporary kings either of India or of Ceylon, while the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* expressly says that he began to write his work in the 20th year and completed it at the commencement of the 21st year of the reign of a famous king of Ceylon deserving the epithet of *Sirikuḍḍa, Siripāla.*

5. King Mahānāma with whose reign the literary career of the author of the *Visuddhimagga* is connected by tradition, was rather an infamous king and utterly unworthy of any praise from a celebrity of the Mahāvihāra.

6. The author of the *Samantapāsādikā* refers to a very troublesome time after which peace was restored in the country, while no such gloomy picture of the time is given in the writings of Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga.*

7. The Kings of India and Ceylon who find an incidental mention in the works of the author of the *Visuddhimagga* are all pre-Gupta, and the Buddhist sects and schools of his time figure prominently in the Indian inscriptions which are also pre-Gupta in date.

8. The author of the *Samantapāsādikā* was aware of the disparity in weight which existed between the coins struck on the model of those issued by Rudradāman and the *nīla* and *kālakahāpaṇas.* The Rudradāmaka class of coins was widely current at the time of the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, and their use continued almost up to the beginning of the Gupta reign.[1]

9. So far as the treatment of the common Sutta topics in the *Samantapāsādikā* is concerned, it clearly presupposes not only the *Visuddhimagga* and the commentaries written by its author, but also the *Paramatthajotikā* which may be

---

[1] B. C. Law, *Buddhistic Studies*, I, pp. 383ff.

ascribed to Culla-Buddhaghosa or Buddhaghosa II, a thera of Ceylon, whose literary career may also be assigned to the reign of one and the same king deserving the epithet of *Sirikuḍḍa* or *Sirikūṭa* or *Sirigutta*.

10. Both the authors of the *Visuddhimagga* and the *Samantapāsādikā* have pronounced judgment on the textual and doctrinal position of certain Mahāyāna works offered for acceptance as authentic and authoritative, the former in one list and the latter in two separate lists, the findings of the latter being more thorough-going than those of the former.

11. The discussion about these Mahāyāna works is inconceivable before Goṭhābhaya Meghavaṇṇa during whose reign, as the *Mahāvaṃsa* records, a conference was held at Thūpārāma for an open discussion of the doctrinal issues between the theras of the Mahāvihāra and the Coḷiyan monk Saṅghamitta who went from the Indian shore to defend the cause of the Vetullakas when they were banished from the island of Ceylon by King Goṭhābhaya persuaded by the theras of the Mahāvihāra.

12. Neither the prologue nor the epilogue of the *Samantapāsādikā* refers to the *Visuddhimagga*.

It is undeniable that in the prologue to his first four *Nikāya* and *Abhidhamma commentaries*, the great Buddhaghosa not only mentions the *Visuddhimagga* by name but also states that in explaining the doctrinal points which are accurately and elaborately dealt with in it, his comments will be brief and concise:

> *Iti pana sabbaṃ yasmā Visuddhimagge mayā suparisuddhaṃ*
> *vuttaṃ, tasmā bhīyo na taṃ idha vicārayissāmi.*
> *Majjhe Visuddhimaggo esa catunnaṃ pi āgamānaṃ hi*
> *Ṭhatvā pakāsayissati tattha yathā bhāsitaṃ atthaṃ.*[1]
> *Visuddhimagge pan'idaṃ yasmā sabbaṃ pakāsitaṃ*
> *tasmā tam agahetvāna sakalāya pi tantiyā*
> *padānukkamato eva karissām'atthavaṇṇanaṃ.*[2]

In the *Samantapāsādikā*, on the other hand, there is no such reference to the *Visuddhimagga* and other works of the great commentator. In its prologue, the reference is made only to the three older Sinhalese commentaries. It was

---

[1] *Sumangalavilāsinī*, I, p. 2; *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p. 2, *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 2, *Manorathapūranī*, I, p. 2

[2] *Atthasālinī*, p. 2.

written independently as a commentary on the *Vinaya Piṭaka*:

> *Yasmiṃ ṭhite sāsanaṃ aṭṭhitassā*
> *patiṭṭhitaṃ hoti susaṇṭhitassa*
> *taṃ vaṇṇayissam Vinayaṃ amissaṃ*
> *nissāya pubbācariyānubhāvaṃ.*[1]

If this were not the case, he would not certainly have thought it necessary to elaborately deal with the common Sutta topics, such as the *Three Refuges*, and the *Jhānas*. His treatment of these topics takes the form of so many dissertations, although written to a great extent relying on the *Visuddhimagga*, the *Nikāya commentaries*, the *Atthasālinī*, and even the *Paramatthajotikā*.

The author of the *Visuddhimagga* has no respect for any individual opinion regarding the interpretation of a doctrinal point, nor even for *ācarya-mata* or views of a school of teachers, if these are neither in the *Aṭṭhakathās* nor in the canonical texts:

Yasmā pana idaṃ cariyā-vibhāvana-vidhānaṃ sabbā-kārena n'eva Pāliyaṃ, na Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ āgataṃ, kevalam ācariyamatānusārena vuttaṃ, tasmā na sārato paccetabbaṃ. Yaṃ pan'etaṃ Aṭṭhakathāsu cariyā-vibhāvana-vidhānaṃ vuttaṃ tad eva sārato paccetabbaṃ.[2]

On this very subject we have the considered opinion of the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*. Here his approach to the subject is very rational and his findings command respect. In his judgment, even if any interpretation be offered either as one's own opinion (*attano mati*) or as the opinion of a school of teachers, it should be tested by the application of a criterion of judgment. So he opines:

Catubbidho Vinayo jānitabbo: Suttaṃ Suttānulomaṃ Ācariyavādaṃ attano mati ti. . . . Taṃ pana attano matiṃ gahetvā kathentena na daḷhaggāhaṃ gahetvā voharitabbaṃ, kāraṇaṃ sallakkhetvā atthena Pāliṃ Pāliyā ca atthaṃ saṃsan-detvā kathetabbaṃ. Attano mati ācariyavāde otāretabbā. Sace tattha otarati c'eva sameti ca gahetabbā. . . .

The author of the *Visuddhimagga* is generally very uncharitable to his opponents if they happen to belong to a school other than the Mahāvihāra and not infrequently refers to them as *vitaṇḍavādin* or *vidaḍḍhavādin*, or, with a feeling of contempt, as 'others' (*apare*). This is not the way of the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*.

It is difficult to say that the author of the *Visuddhimagga* lived long enough to go again to Ceylon to write the *Vinaya*

---

[1] *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 1. [2] *Visuddhimagga*, I, p. 107

commentaries. But certain it is that he too was an Indian who appears to have gone to Ceylon from western India and Vindhya region and passed through the Andhra and Cola countries. He records, for instance, that the Vindhya forest was without any human habitation.[1] His statement that the Magadha *nāḷī* (a measure) corresponded to 12½ *pala* which was the standard weight, and that the *nāḷī* of Ceylon was greater in weight than that of the Damiḷa country, was based upon the Andhaka and Mahāvihāra *Aṭṭhakathās*.[2]

The author of the *Visuddhimagga* found the *kahāpaṇas* meaning the punch-marked coins to be long (*dīgha*), oblong (*caturassa*), and round (*parimaṇḍala*),[3] and characteristically observed that a coin-expert could, after taking the *kahāpaṇas* in his hand, tell at once in which village or town or city, whether on a hill or a river-bank they were struck and by whom among the coin-makers.[4]

The information supplied by the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* on the subject is more definite and historical in character. Here he speaks of the *Rūpasutta*[5] or numismatic text which was a secular subject of study. He further points out that in the Buddha's time one *kahāpaṇa* as current in Rājagṛha, was equal to 20 *māsakas*, one *pāda* was therefore equal to 5 *māsakas*, but that was according to the standard weight of the silver punch-marked coins (*so ca kho porāṇassa nīlakahāpaṇassa vasena*), and not according to the standard weight of the coins modelled after those issued by Rudradāman (*na itaresaṃ Rudradāmakādīnaṃ*).[6]

The views of the two authors on the common points are substantially the same. The *Samantapāsādikā* exhibits a greater maturity of judgment and better intellectual equipment. Whether the two authors were one and the same individual or not, the fact remains that the *Samantapāsādikā* represents a later development of the views advocated by the author of the *Visuddhimagga*.

Dhammapāla: The *Sāsanavaṃsa* connects him with the island of Ceylon on no other ground than that he lived at Padaratittha (Badaratittha) in the kingdom of Damiḷa (Drāviḍa) in the neighbourhood of Ceylon.[7] It would have been perhaps more correct to say that as a man of Kāñcīpura

[1] *Samantapāsādikā*, III, p. 655.
[2] *Ibid*, III, p. 702
[3] *Visuddhimagga*, p. 437.
[4] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, Sinhalese Ed., p. 215.
[5] *Samantapāsādikā*, Sinhalese Ed., II, p. 86
[6] *Ibid*, Sinhalese Ed., I, 172.
[7] *So ca ācariya-Dhammapālatthero Sīhaladīpassa samīpe Damiḷaraṭṭhe Padaratitthamhi nivāsitattā Sīhaladīpe yeva sangahetvā vattabbo*—p. 33.

in the country of Cola he belonged to the same school of Theravāda as the Buddhist Theras of Ceylon and that, like his three great predecessors, he was a celebrity of the school of Mahāvihāra. His commentaries were based upon the *Porāṇ-aṭṭhakathā* as developed and cherished in the Mahāvihāra. The tradition rightly ascribes to him the commentaries on the eight books of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*,[1] a commentary on the *Nettippakaraṇa* and a *ṭīkā* on the *Visuddhimagga* known by the name of *Paramatthamañjūsā* besides the *Līnatthappakāsinī*, the *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* and other works.

In the opinion of T. W. Rhys Davids, Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla seem to have been educated at the same University. In support of this view he refers to the published works of the two writers, a careful study of which shows that they hold very similar views, they appeal to the same authorities, they have the same method of exegesis, they have reached the same stage in philological and etymological science and they have the same lack of any knowledge of the simplest rules of the higher criticism. The conclusion follows that as far as we can at present judge, they must have been trained in the same school.[2]

Mrs. Rhys Davids thus observes: 'In the fifth or sixth century A.D., either before or just after Buddhaghosa had flourished and written his great commentaries on the prose works of the *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭakas*, Dhammapāla of Kāñcīpura (now Conjeeveram), wrote down in Pāli the unwritten expository material constituting the then extant three *Aṭṭhakathās* on the Psalms and incorporated it into his commentary on the three other books of the Canon, naming the whole "*Paramatthadīpanī*" or "Elucidation of the Ultimate Meaning". He not only gives the *ākhyāna* in each Psalm, but adds a paraphrase in the Pāli of his day, of the more archaic idiom in which the *gāthās* were compiled.'[3]

She further says, 'The presentation of verses, solemn or otherwise, in a framework of prose narrative is essentially the historical Buddhist way of imparting canonical poetry. Dhammapāla's chronicles are, for the most part, unduplicated in any other extant work; but not seldom they run on all fours, not only with parallel chronicles in Buddhaghosa's commentaries, but also with the prose framework of poems in

---

[1] *Thera-Therī-gāthā, Udāna* and *Itivuttaka, Petavatthu* and *Vimānavatthu, Cariyāpiṭaka* and *Apadāna*

[2] Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. IV, p. 701

[3] Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Psalms of the Sisters*, p. xvi.

Sutta-nipāta or *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, not to mention the *Jātaka*.'[1]

Dhammapāla had evidently a great admiration for Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, and faithfully followed the lead given by his illustrious predecessor. The views of the latter have been upheld throughout his works. He was well read and well informed. His prose style is lucid and clear, and his expositions, such as those of the *Bodhi-Suttas* in the *Udāna*, assume the form of dissertations. There is evidence to show that he had studied the *Bhagavadgītā*. The commentaries written by him contain, like those written by his predecessors, a good deal of information about the social, religious, philosophical and ethical ideas of the time.

Upasena: He is known as the gifted author of two Pāli commentaries, namely, those on the *Culla* and *Mahā Niddesas*. These commentaries known by the name of *Saddhammapajjotikā* were written on the method and in the style of the *Paramatthajotikā*, the commentary on the *Sutta-nipāta*. He tells us in the epilogue to his work that he used to reside in a monastery at Anurādhapura erected for him by a scribe called Kittisena and finished his duty of writing the commentary in the 26th year of the reign of king Siri-Saṅghabodhi who is honoured with the epithet of *Siri-nivāsa*.[2]

Mahānāma: He was another erudite Thera of Ceylon who completed the task left unfinished by the great Buddhaghosa and other predecessors by writing the *Saddhammapakāsinī* as a commentary on the *Patisambhidāmagga* in a simple and clear style. In the epilogue to the work, he tells us that he finished his work in the third year after the death of king Moggallāna,[3] while he was residing in the Uttaramantiparivena of the Mahāvihāra. That he followed in the footsteps of the great Buddhaghosa as regards his exposition of the four *paṭisambhidās* is undoubted and the fact may be well established by the following citation from his work which is partly a verbatim reproduction and partly an elaboration of Buddhaghosa's explanation of *niruttipaṭisambhidā* in the *Sammohavinodanī*:

[1] Mrs Rhys Davids, *Psalms of the Brethren*, p xxv

[2] *rañño Sirinivāsassa Sirisanghassa Bodhino*
chabbīsatimhi vassamhi niṭṭhitā Niddesa-vannanā

Sirisanghabodhi must be identified with a king of Ceylon who reigned for more than 26 years He can be better identified with king Vijayabāhu I (A D 1059–1114)

[3] Some hold that he was probably king Moggallāna I who reigned in the first half of the seventh century. He may better be identified with Moggallāna III, father and predecessor of Vijayabāhu I, in which case Mahānāma and Upasena will figure as contemporaries.

Yo pi agāmake mahāraññe nibbatto tattha añño kathento nāma natthi so pi attano dhammatāya vacanaṃ samuṭṭhāpento Māgadhabhāsam eva bhāsissati. Niraye tiracchānayoniyaṃ pettivisaye manussaloke devaloke ti sabbattha Māgadhabhāsā va ussannā. Tattha sesā Oṭṭa-Kirāta-Andhaka-Yona-Damiḷa-bhāsādikā aṭṭhārasabhāsā parivattanti.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Sammohavinodanī* (*P.T S.*), pp. 387-88

Chapter V

WORKS

The first work of Buddhaghosa which he wrote before going to Ceylon is known as *Ñāṇodaya*. Dhammakitti in his *Mahāvaṃsa Supplement* tells us that Buddhaghosa wrote it out as a treatise meaning it to serve as a supplement to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* which is counted as the first *Abhidhamma* treatise.[1] Buddhaghosa in the general introduction to his *Atthasālinī*, gives an account of the contents of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, according to which, the first *Abhidhamma* treatise as then known to him comprised four main divisions, each called a *kaṇḍa: Cittakaṇḍa, Rūpakaṇḍa, Nikkhepakaṇḍa* and *Aṭṭhakathā kaṇḍa*.[2] If so, there is no reason to suppose that the *Ñānodaya* forms a part of the text of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* as we now have it, although Dhammakitti is very definite in stating that Buddhaghosa made it a *kaṇḍa* of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*. It is difficult to risk any opinion on this point until perchance the text of the *Ñāṇodaya* is obtained from Siam or elsewhere.

The *Visuddhimagga* is certainly the first great work written by Buddhaghosa in Ceylon and by writing it he permanently established his reputation as an exponent of Buddhism. Dr. P. V. Bapat has been at pains to show that the views of the opponent criticized in the *Visuddhimagga* belonged to the *Vimuttimagga* written earlier by Thera *Upatissa* who was presumably an adherent of the rival school of Abhayagiri.[3] Even it is maintained by others that the Theras of the Mahāvihāra made Buddhaghosa a hero obviously for the reason that they found in him the most capable among the Mahāvihārins to outdo the work of a partisan of the rival school. However the *Visuddhimagga* was certainly the first work of Buddhaghosa in Ceylon and it presupposes no earlier *Piṭaka* commentaries than those written in Sinhalese. After this he wrote out the commentaries on the first *Four Nikāyas*, and then the commentaries on the seven *Abhidhamma* books in their accepted order of enumeration. It may be worth our while to give a detailed account of each of them, in the chronological order.

---

[1] *Cūḷavamsa*, Chap. XXXVII.
Tattha Ñāṇodayam nāma katvā pakaranaṃ tadā Dhammasaṅganyā' kāsi kaṇḍam.

[2] *Atthasālinī*, p. 6

[3] *Vimuttimagga* and *Visuddhimagga*, pp. xvii ff.

Visuddhimagga[1]: This is an encyclopaedic work on Buddhism, written by Buddhaghosa at the request of Thera Saṅghapāla. It is generally believed that it was written in Ceylon in the time of king Mahānāma. That it was Buddhaghosa's first production in Ceylon is beyond doubt. Buddhaghosa requested the priesthood of Ceylon to give him access to all their books as he was desirous of translating the *Aṭṭhakathā*. In order to test his capability the Theras of the Mahāvihāra gave him two *gāthās* to explain. The ripe fruit of the attempt made was the *Visuddhimagga* which does not presuppose any earlier Pāli commentary. It refers, however, to the *Aṭṭhakathās* available in Sinhalese only. It is undoubtedly a marvellous production and is said to have been composed 'under somewhat romantic circumstances'. It has earned for him an everlasting fame. It is considered to be the only book in which the whole Buddhist system is well depicted. It does not contribute anything to the *Piṭakas* themselves but it aims at a systematic arrangement of their contents. It is not a commentary on any single text but claims to be a compendium of the Buddha's doctrine as a whole.[2] Spence Hardy is right in pointing out that this work presents an abstract of the doctrinal and metaphysical parts of the Buddhistical creed, which acquires an authority and authenticity, which no compendium exclusively formed by any orientalist of a different faith can have any claim to.[3]

The *Mahāvaṃsa* account of the circumstances that led to the composition of this work, agrees substantially with what is found in it. Buddhaghosa begins the dissertation by quoting the two stanzas from the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* and proceeds with it by way of explaining it elaborately. The stanzas cited are as follows:—

Sīle patiṭṭhāya naro sapañño,
cittaṃ paññaṃ ca bhāvayam,
Ātāpī nipakò bhikkhu,
so imaṃ vijaṭaye jaṭanti.

[1] A P. Buddhadatta and D. A. Gunawardhana have edited and published two Sinhalese editions of the *Visuddhimagga* There is a Burmese edition of this text by Saya U Phye Mrs Rhys Davids' English translation of the first two chapters of the *Visuddhimagga* deserves mention Some portions of this text with Sanskrit translation have been printed in *the Journal of the Buddhist Text Society* There is an incomplete edition in Bengali by Gopaldas Chowdhury and Samana Punnānanda, published in 1923 Due to the combined labours of Mrs Rhys Davids and Mr Pe Maung Tin a readable English translation entitled the *Path of Purity* has come out under the auspices of the Pali Text Society of England

[2] *Buddhism, Primitive and Present*, p. 212.

[3] *Manual of Buddhism*, pp. 531-2

A wise man should think of meditation and wisdom after having been established in the precepts. An active and wise bhikkhu disentangles this lock. Buddhaghosa records the circumstances under which he wrote his *Visuddhimagga* (I, p. 2). At the end of the work again, Buddhaghosa repeats these very *gāthās*. He says that the interpretation of *sīla*, etc., has been given in the *Aṭṭhakathās* on the five *Nikāyas*. The interpretation gradually becomes manifest, being free from all faults due to confusion, and it is for this reason that the *Visuddhimagga* should be liked by the *Yogis* who are desirous of obtaining purity and who have pure wisdom.

The vocabulary of this work is astonishingly rich as compared with the archaic simplicity of the *Piṭakas*. The quotations in the *Visuddhimagga* from the *Piṭakas*, the *Porāṇas*, the Sinhalese *Aṭṭhakathās*, etc., are innumerable. It contains the whole of the Theravāda Buddhism in a nutshell. In it, Buddhaghosa is strong in his attacks on *Pakativāda*, i.e. the Sāṅkhya and Yoga systems which believe in the dual principles of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. He shows an extravagant zeal for differentiating the Buddhist conception of *avijjā* or ignorance from the Prakṛtivādin's conception of *Prakṛti* as the root cause of things.[1]

It is evident from the *Visuddhimagga* that Buddhaghosa had a fair knowledge of anatomy.[2]

In this work Buddhaghosa treats of such topics as *dhūtaṅgas* (ascetic practices), *kammatthānas* (objects of concentration), *anussatis* (recollections), *samādhi* (concentration), *abhiññā* (higher knowledge), *khandhas* (aggregates), *āyatanas* (sense organs), *indriyas* (controlling faculties), etc.

Strict observance of the *sīlas* leads to the purification of the body while the practice of *samādhi* or concentration leads to the purity of soul, and the development of *paññā* or wisdom to perfect wisdom. As the ways to attain to purity or *visuddhi* have been explained in the text, it is called *Visuddhimagga* or the Path of Purity.

An account of the contents of the *Visuddhimagga* is given in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* which runs thus: 'The nature of the *sīlakathā*, *dhūtadhammā*, *kammatthānāni* together with all the *cariyāvidhāni*, *jhānāni*, the whole scope of the *samāpatti*, the whole of *abhiññā*, the exposition of the *paññā*, the *khandha*, the *dhātu*, the *āyatanāni*, *indriyāni*, the four *ariyasaccāni*, the *paccayākāra*, the pure and the comprehensive *naya* and the indispensable *magga* and *vipassanābhāvanā*.'[3]

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, II, p 525 [2] *Ibid.*, I, pp 249–265

[3] *Sumangalavilāsini*, pp 1-2

Nagai in the *J.P.T.S.*[1] points out that the *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa is but a revised version of the *Vimuttimagga* by a thera named Upatissa of Ceylon. He further says that Upatissa belonged to the first century A.D. and was a contemporary of Vasabha of Ceylon (A.D. 66–109). The work is entirely lost in Ceylon and it exists only in a Chinese translation dated A.D. 505 by a Cambodian priest named Saṅghapāla. Nagai in section V of his article, shows how the Chinese text agrees generally with the Pāli text of the *Visuddhimagga*. According to him the difference in each case can be accounted for on the ground of re-arrangement, interpolation or curtailment. The description of the Chinese on the whole is much simpler than that of the Pāli.

The *Paramatthamañjūsā* is a scholium on the *Visuddhimagga* written by Dhammapāla. The *Visuddhimaggagaṇṭhi*, a Burmese Pāli work, explains the difficult passages of the *Visuddhimagga*.[2]

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī: This is a commentary on the *Dīgha Nikāya* written by Buddhaghosa at the request of the Saṅgha Thera Dātha.[3] It contains a variety of information, historical, geographical, philosophical and religious. A vivid picture of sports and pastimes may be gathered from it. It gives us a glimpse of Buddhaghosa's wide learning. There is a scholium on this work known as *Paṭhamasāratthamañjūsā*. The language of this commentary is less confused than that of the other commentaries written by Buddhaghosa. There are Sinhalese and Burmese editions of this work.

In the introductory verses, Buddhaghosa gives a history of its composition. The *Visuddhimagga*, according to him, stands for explaining the meaning of the four *āgamas*.[4] The *Sumaṅgalavilasinī* is based upon the authority of the *Four Āgamas* and the *Visuddhimagga* and is directly based upon the *Āgamaṭṭhakathā* in Sinhalese. Here the author speaks of the four kinds of *Suttas*: (1) *Attajjhāsayo*, i.e. a *Sutta* delivered by the Buddha of his own accord; (2) *Parajjhāsayo*, i.e. a *Sutta* delivered to suit the requirement of others; (3) *Pucchāvasiko*, i.e. a *Sutta* delivered in answer to a question; and (4) *Aṭṭhuppatiko*, i.e. a *Sutta* delivered by way of introducing other *Suttas*.

Some information regarding the daily life of a bhikkhu has been given here. In the daytime a bhikkhu should free his mind from all obstacles by walking up and down and

[1] 1917–1919, pp. 69–80.
[2] Bode, *Pali Literature of Burma*, p. 19 f.n.
[3] Variant *Dāṭhānāga*.
[4] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p. 2.

sitting. In the first watch of the night he should lie down and in the last watch he should walk up and down and sit. Early in the morning he should go and cleanse the space surrounding the *Cetiya* and the Bodhi-tree. He should give water to the root of the Bo-tree, and keep water for drinking and washing. He should then perform all his duties towards his teacher. After finishing ablution, he should enter his own dwelling place, take his rest on the ground and think of *kammaṭṭhāna*. At the time of going for alms, he should sit up from meditation, and after taking his alms-bowl and garment he should first of all go to the Bodhi-tree and after saluting it he should go to the *Cetiya*. After he has saluted the *Cetiya*, he should enter the village for alms and after having finished begging for alms, he should give religious instruction to many persons desirous of hearing it. Then he should return to the *vihāra*.[1]

Buddhaghosa refers to the following sports and pastimes and to the various kinds of seats: dice (*aṭṭhapadaṃ*), sporting with an iron ball (*caṇḍālaṃ*), a kind of pastime which is played after imagining a kind of dice-board in the sky (*ākāsaṃ*), sporting with a bamboo which is turned in various ways (*vaṃsam*), a sport in which large sticks are beaten by short ones (*ghaṭikaṃ*), and a kind of sport which is played on the ground on which many paths having fences are prepared to puzzle the players.[2] As regards seats, a big seat, a carpet with long hairs (*goṇakaṃ*), a silk seat decorated with gems, a kind of woollen seat in which 16 dancing girls can dance together, a seat having feet with figure of deer, etc., thick woollen seat with many designs of flowers, woollen seat, and a seat having the figure of lion or tiger may be mentioned.[3]

Buddhaghosa refers to an aboriginal custom prevalent in South India, namely, that of washing the bones of dead relatives after digging them out and besmearing them with scents. On an auspicious day they used to eat various kinds of food collected for the occasion while crying for their departed relatives.[4]

Many ascetics used to live in the Dakkhiṇāpatha and one of the forefathers of Ambaṭṭha went there and learnt *ambaṭṭhavijjā*, a science through the influence of which the weapon once raised could be brought down. He came to Okkāka and showed his skill and secured a post under him.[5]

---

[1] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, pp 186-7.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 84-5.
[3], [4] *Ibid.*, I, pp 84 foll.
[5] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p. 265.

The account of the First Buddhist Council shows a blending of the *Vinaya* account in the *Cullavagga*, Ch. XI, and that in the Pāli Chronicles. The two *Pātimokkhas* are mentioned as the texts that were not recited. The interest of the account lies in the fact that it clearly sets forth the circumstances leading to the rise of the different schools of the Bhāṇakas for the preservation and transmission of the *Nikāyas* and *Vinaya* texts through chanting. It records, moreover, that the four books of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, which were evidently later additions, were not in the list of the Dīghabhāṇakas.[1]

✓The division of the *tāpasas* (hermits) into eight kinds and their definitions are interesting.[2] Similarly the accounts of the judicial system of the Vajjian confederacy of Vesālī,[3] and of the cause of king Ajātasattu's grudge against the Vajjis,[4] and the legend of Asoka stating that prince Piyadāsa (Priyadarśana) would assume the title of Asoka[5] at the time of his coronation, are noteworthy. The prophecy about Asoka[6] is in agreement with the *Dīpavaṃsa* tradition, according to which, prince Piyadassana was coronated twice, once under the title of Asoka and subsequently under the title of Piyadassi.

Papañcasūdanī: It is a commentary on the *Majjhima Nikāya* written by Buddhaghosa. Like other works of the great Pāli scholiast, the *Papañcasūdanī* has been found in the Singhalese, Burmese and Siamese manuscripts. The text of the *Majjhima Nikāya* as presupposed by its commentary, precisely like the texts of the three other *Nikāyas* as presupposed by their commentaries, is what is now found in the *P.T.S.* and other editions. The introductory verses of the first Four *Nikāya commentaries* refer to the *Visuddhimagga* and the *Four Āgamas*. This particular *Aṭṭhakathā* is said to have been written in compliance with a request made to Buddhaghosa by the Most Venerable Buddhamitta while they were staying together at Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana (modern Mayaveram) in South India. The Four *Nikāya commentaries* are composed in the same Pāli prose style, and all of them are full of legendary materials and historical and geographical

[1] *Sumangalavilāsinī*, pp 8ff [2] *Ibid*, I, pp 270ff

[3] *Ibid*, II, p 519; B C Law, *Some Kṣatriya Tribes in Ancient India*, pp 90ff

[4] *Ibid*, II, p 516, B C Law, *Some Kṣatriya Tribes in Ancient India*, pp 111ff

[5] *Ibid*, II, p. 612 *Anāgate Piyadāso kumāro chattam ussāpetvā Asoko nāma dhammarājā bhavissati.*

[6] *Dīpavamsa*, VI, 22

details. Their common authorship is evident from the identical explanations of the common topics.

In the *Papañcasūdanī* Buddhaghosa records that to facilitate an easy understanding of the *Three Vedas* the teachers conversant with the local dialects expounded either through the medium of Tamil or through that of Telugu and the like.[1] Here he points out that the Buddha, too, adapted his teachings to the needs of his hearers when he presented them either from the popular standpoint (*sammuti, sammati*), or from the scientific or philosophic standpoint (*paramattha*). The authoritative verse quoted in this connection corresponds with Nāgārjuna's opinion as stated in the *Mādhyamika Kārikā*:

> *Duve saccāni akkhāsi sambuddho vadataṃ varo*
> *sammutiṃ paramatthañ ca tatiyaṃ nūpalabbhati.*[2]
>
> *Dve satye samupāśritya Buddhānaṃ dharmadeśanā*
> *saṃvṛti paramārthaś ca tritiyaṃ nāsti kiñcanaṃ.*[3]

Just as in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, so in the *Papañcasūdanī*, Buddhaghosa distinguishes Pāli, as the language of the *Buddhavacana* endowed with the ten qualities of having the sounds discriminated as low accented or high-accented, long and short in syllabic representation, long and short in metre, nasalized, connected, arranged and free[4] from the Drāviḍa, Kirāta, Yavana and other Mleccha languages that were wanting in all the consonantal sounds.[5] The Siamese edition has wrongly Savana as a variant for Yavana. By the Yavana language was probably meant Latin, the language of the Romans, whose trade connection with the place near about Kāñcīpura (Conjeeveram) from the second century B.C. is proved by certain clear traces recently found by the Department of Archaeology.

In connection with the *Ariyapariyesana*, *Mahāsaccaka* and other *Suttas*, Buddhaghosa records certain interesting

---

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, pp 137-8 *Yathā hi desabhāsākusalo tinnam vedānam atthasamvannanako ācariyo, ye Damiḷabhāsāya vutte attham jānanti, tesam Damilabhāsāya ācikkhati, ye Andhakabhāsādisu aññatarāya, tesam tāya tāya bhāsāya*

[2] *Ibid*, I, p 138

[3] *Mādhyamika Kārikā*

[4] *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p 203:

> *Sithiladhanitañ ca dīgharassam*
> *garukalahukañ ca niggahītam*
> *sambandhanamvavatthitam vimuttam*
> *dasadhā byañjanabuddhiyā pabhedo.*

[5] *Ibid.*, II, p 203· *Damila-kirāta-Yavanādi-Milakkhānam bhāsā viya byañjanapāripūriyā abhāvato.* The Ṭīkā adds also the name of the Pārasika-bhāsā.

legends of the Buddha which are to be found in the *Jātaka Nidānakathā*.

Săratthappakāsinī[1]: This is the commentary on the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* written by Buddhaghosa at the request of the Most Venerable Jotipāla. It is equally rich in legendary, historical and geographical materials, and it throws a good deal of light on the social, religious, political, and economic life of India and Ceylon. Although Buddhaghosa speaks of two kinds of measure, *nāḷī* and *doṇa*,[2] he does not point out in the manner of the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* the difference which existed between the *nāḷīs* that were in use in Magadha,[3] Drāviḍa and Ceylon. He supplies a very interesting piece of information about a class of heretical Brahmin teachers known as *Nakha*[4] or *Saṃkhyā*[5] Pāsaṇḍabrāhmaṇa who used to instruct the masses in the law of Karma by drawing pictures in a portable gallery, illustrating the happy or unhappy results of human deeds on earth and appropriately labelling them with inscriptions. The class of painting produced by them was known in the Buddha's time by the name of *Caraṇacitta* or 'rambling painting'. He gives a detailed account of this pictorial art in his Atthasālinī.[6]

Attention may be drawn also to another piece of interesting information supplied by Buddhaghosa regarding the appearance of gods among men, which may throw some light on Asoka's statement about the commingling of gods and men in Jambudvīpa (M.R.E.). We are told that gods while appearing in the human world give up their natural complexion and power and assume a tangible form in excelling glory and power as if they were well-dressed men going to witness a theatrical or musical performance. In other words, they come down and appear in finely dressed human forms.[7]

In this particular work Buddhaghosa offers us a list of the Mahāyāna texts that are evidently of the Dhāraṇī and

---

[1] It has been published in three volumes by the *P T S.* under the able editorship of F L Woodward Palm-leaf manuscripts are available (B. C Law, *History of Pali Literature*, II, p. 439)

[2] *Sāratthappakāsini*, I, pp 152-3

[3] *Samantapāsādikā*, III, 702.

[4] This is the name found in the Siamese edition and it was probably a mistake for *Makha* or *Mamkha* meaning 'artist'.

[5] The variant *Samkhyā*, met with in the *P.T.S* edition, may be taken to have been the same word as *Ganaka*.

[6] *Sāratthappakāsini*, II, p 327, *Atthasālini*, p 64.

[7] *Sāratthappakāsini*, I, p. 14 *Devatā hi manussalokam āgacchamānā pakativannam pakati-iddhim jahitvā olārikam attabhāvam katvā atirekavaṇṇam atireka-iddhim māpetvā naṭasamajjādini gacchantā, manussā viya abhisankhatena kāyena āgacchanti*

Guhyasamaya and Vaidalya classes [1] and declares them as unauthentic and unauthoritative on this two-fold ground: (1) that they had not passed through the first Three Buddhist Councils, and (2) that they deal with themes which do not fall within the scope of the recognized topics of Buddhism. In this connexion he gives an account of the process of gradual disappearance of the Piṭaka texts (*pariyattiantaradhānaṃ*) which is met with in almost the same form in the *Anāgatavaṃsa.*

Manorathapūraṇī [2]: This is the commentary on the *Anguttara Nikāya* written by Buddhaghosa in compliance with a request made to him by the Most Venerable Jotipāla while they were staying together at Kāñcīpura and other places (in South India) and subsequently at the Mahāvihāra in the island of Tāmraparni. In the first part of this work Buddhaghosa gives a legendary account of the Theras, the Therīs and the Upāsakas and the Upāsikās who were placed foremost by the Buddha for having excelled others in certain special gifts, acts or attainments.

The vivid accounts of the continent of Jambudvīpa, the Anotatta Lake with its four outlets on the four sides known as *Sīhamukha, Hatthimukha, Assamukha* and *Usabhamukha*, the channelling out of the four rivers, especially of the origin of the Ganges, are repeated in the *Suttanipāta* commentary.

The definition of the four kinds of sacrifice called *Sassamedha, Purisamedha, Sammāpāsa* and *Vājapeyya* in terms of the four *sangahavatthus* on the part of the righteous and wise rulers is evidently a departure from the Brahmanical tradition and it is coloured by the Buddhist idea of piety. The account of the Horse sacrifice (*Assamedha*) is found to be inconsistent with the definition of the four *medhas* mentioned above.

Buddhaghosa gives a romantic description of the three tanks and palaces of the Bodhisatta, prince Siddhattha.

Atthasālinī [3]: It is an important commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* or *Dhammasaṅgaha*, the first treatise of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka.* Like the *Sammohavinodanī*, it was

---

[1] *Ibid.*, II, pp. 201-2 *Tisso pana saṅgitiyo anārulham Dhātukathā Ārammaṇakathā Asubhakathā Ñānavatthukathā Vijjākaraṇḍako ti imehi pañcahi kathāvatthūhi bāhiram Guḷha Vinayam Guḷha Vessantaram Vannapiṭakam Angulimālapiṭakam Raṭṭhapālagajjitam Ālavakagajjitam Vedallapiṭakanti abuddhavacanam pariyatti-saddhammapaṭirūpakam nāma*

[2] The *Cātutthasāratthamañjūsā* or the ṭīkā on the *Manorathapūranī* written by a pupil of Sumedha Thera. The complete work has been printed in Ceylon, Burma and Siam

[3] E Muller edited this text for the *P T.S.* Pe Maung Tin has translated it into English. There is a scholium on the *Atthasālinī* called the *Paṭhamaparamatthapakāsinī.*

written by Buddhaghosa at the request of his namesake, the Bhikkhu or Yati Buddhaghosa who is now taken to be the same person as Culla Buddhaghosa to whom the *Gandhavaṃsa* ascribes two commentaries.

It contains some historical and geographical information besides the explanations of the technical terms of Buddhist psychology. In the introductory verses Buddhaghosa says that he had already dealt with some of the points in his *Visuddhimagga*. Although the *Atthasālinī* aims to be an exposition of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, yet there is some anomaly in the contents and arrangements of the two books. There are some chapters of the text which the commentary omits and some chapters which it adds independently of the text.

Dr. Bapat and Mr. Vadekar have listed a number of disparities, which are rather verbal than real, between this work and the *Visuddhimagga* as regards the treatment of certain common topics.[1]

In the general introduction, Buddhaghosa describes the contents of the Abhidhamma treatises and discusses many textual problems. According to him there was a school of Buddhist teachers who were reluctant to include the *Kathāvatthu* in the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*. The *Dhammahadayavibhaṅga* which now forms the concluding section of the second Abhidhamma treatise was counted before as a separate book, say, before the *Kathāvatthu* took its place.[2]

The general introduction is made unduly long and tedious by including in it an account of the *avidūre nidāna* of the Bodhisatta's life.

The most important contribution made in this work is the dissertation known as *Dvārakathā*.

As distinguished from the *Visuddhimagga*, the *Atthasālinī* is less scholastic in style and exhibits more freshness and originality in treatment.

Sammohavinodanī[3]: It is a commentary on the *Vibhaṅga*, written by Buddhaghosa, at the request of his younger contemporary and namesake, Yati Buddhaghosa. It contains the gist of the *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā*. This commentary and the *Visuddhimagga* comment on the same subjects in many places. The *Sammohavinodanī* offers us the exposition of the *khandhas* (constituents), *āyatanas* (spheres), *dhātus* (elements), *saccas* (truths), *indriyas* (senses), *paccayākāras* (interdependent

[1] *Atthasālinī*, Devanāgarī Ed. (Bhandarkar Oriental Series, Poona, No 3, 1942), Introd., pp xxxv–xxxix

[2] B. C Law, *History of Pali Literature*, I

[3] A. P Buddhadatta Thera edited it for P.T.S. in 1923. In Burmese, it was published several times. In Ceylon about half of the book has been printed.

causes), *satipaṭṭhāna* (right recollection), *sammappadhāna* (right concentration), *iddhipādas* (bases of miracles), seven *bojjhaṅgas* (supreme knowledge), *magga* (the noble eightfold path), *jhānas* (stages of meditation), *appamaññā* (consisting in an unlimited or perfect exercise of the qualities of friendliness, compassion, goodwill and equanimity), *sikkhāpadas* (precepts), *paṭisambhidā* (analytical knowledge), *ñāṇa* (true knowledge), etc. In the section on the *dhātus*, the thirty-two parts of the body have been discussed. In the section on the *saccas*, the four Noble Truths are dealt with. The section on the *Paccayākāras* has an interesting discussion on the subject of dependent origination.

Dhātukathāpakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā: This is a commentary written by Buddhaghosa on the third book of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* presumably at the request of the Bhikkhu or Yati Buddhaghosa. It has fourteen sections containing interpretations of the five *khandhas* (constituents), *twelve āyatanas* (spheres), *sixteen dhātus* (elements), and the like.

Puggalapaññatti Aṭṭhakathā[1]: This commentary has an important dissertation on the *Paññattis* or concepts classified and defined according to three different *nayas* or methods, namely, the *Pālinaya*, the *Aṭṭhakathānaya*, and the *Ācariyanaya*. According to the first method, these are to be classified as the concepts of *sacca*, *khandha*, *dhātu*, *āyatana*, *indriya* and *puggala*, the last forming the subject-matter of the treatise itself. According to the second method, we are to discuss the logical significance of the concepts divided into two groups of six each. According to the third method, too, the concepts are to be considered as divided into two groups of six each. The treatment of the subject of *paññattis* in the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* and its commentaries is entirely based upon Buddhaghosa's dissertation.[2]

Kathāvatthuppakaraṇaṭṭhakathā: This commentary edited by Minayeff in the *J.P.T.S.*, 1889, and translated by me under the name '*The Debates Commentary*' (published by the *P.T.S.*, London), differs from the *Atthasālinī* or the *Sammohavinodanī* in that it does not bear a title independently of the name of its Abhidhamma text, the *Kathāvatthuppakarana*. It is an indispensable aid to the study of the *Kathāvatthu* which is not clear in many of its contexts. It helps us to clarify many knotty points and is not without historical importance.

---

[1] Edited for the *P.T.S.* by G. Landsberg and Mrs. Rhys Davids (*J P T.S.*, 1913-1914)

[2] Shwe Zan Aung's *Compendium of Philosophy*, *P.T S.*, Introductory Essay, pp. 4ff.

The text introduces us to the controversies after controversies that took place between the orthodox school and the schismatics, without specifically mentioning the names of the actual or probable disputants. It gives the names of the upholders of controverted points. These were not only one or other of the seventeen schismatic schools that arose, according to tradition, prior to the reign of Asoka, but some schools that arose also after his reign. It is mentioned that the Bāhulikas were otherwise known as the Bahusrutikas. The commentary categorically speaks of the six post-Asokan schools, viz. *Hemavatakā*, *Rājagirikā*, *Siddhatthikā*, *Pubbaseliyā*, *Aparaseliyā* and *Vājiriyā*; while it attributes some of the views to such schools as *Uttarāpathakā*, *Andhakā*, *Vetullakā*, *Hetuvādā* and *Mahāsuññatāvādins* but none to the *Vājiriyas* and *Hemavatakas*. The commentator has associated the Vetullakas with the Mahāsuññatāvādins in certain contexts. He keeps us in the dark as to who the Hetuvādins were, although certain views are definitely attributed to them. The commentary on the *Puggalakathā* is really important for the history of the *Saṅgha* together with a few following *kathās*. All the rest is a gradual accretion to the text itself.

Yamaka-aṭṭhakathā: Following the text, this commentary has been divided into ten chapters, viz. *Mūla-Yamaka*, *Khandha-Yamaka*, *Āyatana-Yamaka*, *Dhātu-Yamaka*, *Sacca-Yamaka*, *Saṅkhāra-Yamaka*, *Anusaya-Yamaka*, *Citta-Yamaka*, *Dhamma-Yamaka* and *Indriya-Yamaka*.

The first chapter *Mūla-Yamaka* treats of *kusaladhamma* and *akusaladhamma*. The second chapter deals with the *kusala* and *akusala dhammas* according to their aggregates (*khandhā*), viz. *rūpa*, *vedanā*, *saññā*, *saṅkhāra* and *viññāna*. This chapter has been divided into three main sections, viz. *paññattivāra*, *pavattivāra* and *pariññāvāra*. The third chapter is devoted to the treatment of *kusala* and *akusala dhammas* according to the twelve *āyatanas*. The fourth chapter treats of *dhammas* according to the elements which are eighteen in number. Here, too, the three ways of explanation have been followed. The remaining chapters deal with truths, constituents (*saṅkhāra*), inclination (*anusaya*), mind (*citta*), *dhamma* and senses (*indriya*). In the section on *dhamma*, *kusala dhamma* and *akusala dhamma* have been explained.

Paṭṭhānappakaraṇa Aṭṭhakathā[1]: This is a commentary on the most difficult of the seven Abhidhamma treatises known as *Paṭṭhāna* or *Mahāpakaraṇa*. The most important disserta-

[1] Edited by Mrs. Rhys Davids for *P.T.S.*, London.

tion on the subject of the twenty-four *paccayas* or relations is found in the first two sections, namely, *uddesavāra* and *niddesavāra*. Buddhaghosa's explanations of the relations differ, in some respects at least, from the treatment of the subject by Vasubandhu in his *Abhidharmakośa*. In this work Buddhaghosa rightly points out that the term *hetu* is employed neither in the Nyāya sense of the major premise in a syllogism nor in the philosophical sense of cause (*kāraṇa*); it is employed just in the psycho-ethical sense of 'motive' or 'spring of action' (*mūlaṭṭhena*).

CHAPTER VI

TEXTUAL AND DOCTRINAL EXPOSITIONS

According to Indian tradition, a commentary means reading new meanings back into old texts according to one's own education and outlook. It explains the words and judgments of others as accurately and faithfully as possible and this remark applies to all commentaries, Sanskrit as well as Pāli. The commentary or *bhāṣya*, as it is called in Sanskrit, implies, of course, an amplification of a condensed utterance or expression which is rich in meaning and significance as the great Sanskrit poet, Māgha, says in his famous *kāvya*[1]; but at the same time there is always an element of originality as the definition given by Bharata in his lexicography shows: 'Those who are versed in the *bhāṣyas* call that a *bhāṣya* wherein the meaning of a condensed saying (*sūtra*) is presented in words that follow the text and where, moreover, the commentator's own words are given.'[2]

Aṭṭhakathā is the Pāli term to denote a *bhāṣya*. The concluding section of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* bears the name of an *Aṭṭhakathā-kaṇḍa* or *Atthuddhāra-kaṇḍa*, although it is lacking in the distinctive features of an *Aṭṭhakathā*. Buddhaghosa in the introduction to his *Puggalapaññatti commentary*, speaks of three different methods of treatment, chronologically coming one after another. These are called *Pāli-naya*, *Aṭṭhakathā-naya* and *Ācariya-naya*. The first is the method of treatment met with in the canon itself. The second is the scholastic method developed and followed in the Sinhalese commentaries upon which he based his own works, while the third is evidently a method of interpretation adopted by individual teachers. The third method had, therefore, a scope for *attano mati* or individual opinion. Buddhaghosa, as we saw, did not attach much importance to individual opinions and the teachers' views. It was to the canonical texts and the Sinhalese commentaries that he attached real importance and value.

Any *Aṭṭhakathā* may also be represented as an *Atthavaṇṇanā*, or simply as a *vaṇṇanā*. The *Niddesas* or *Vibhaṅgas*

---

[1] '*Samkhiptasyāpyatosyaiva vākyasyārthagariyasah*
Suvistaratarāvācobhāṣyabhūtā bhavantu me.' (*Śiśupālabadha*, II, 24)

[2] *Sūtrārtho varnyate yatra padaih sūtrānusāribhih* |
svapadāni ca varnyante bhāṣyam bhāṣyavido viduh ||
This is quoted as *Bharata-vākya* in *Liṅgādisamgrahaṭīkā*.

which were the canonical prototypes of exegesis before Buddhaghosa served to specify the word for word meaning on an analytical method as well as to elaborate the thesis set out in brief. So it was said of Mahākaccāna that he excelled others in his ability for elucidating the meaning of what is stated in brief (*saṃkhittena bhāsitassa atthaṃ vitthārena vibhājeti*). The *Aṭṭhakathās* seek to determine the meaning following what Mahākaccāna, the putative author of the *Netti* and *Peṭakopadesa*, calls the textual and exegetical method (*sutamayena atthaṃ pariyesitabbaṃ*). On the linguistic side, they are to be concerned with the consideration of the texts, the statements in the form of sentences, the grammatical construction of the words, their order, and the like. On the doctrinal side, their concern is to be with preliminary investigation, full investigation, critical examination, comparison, manifestation, signification, exposition, analytical elaboration, and clear declaration (*vicayo pavicayo parikkhā upaparikkhā tulanā saṅkāsanā pakāsanā vivaraṇā vibhajanā uttānīkaraṇā*).[1]

The Buddha himself propounded a definite method in terms of four great instructions (*cattāro mahāpadesā*), meaning it to be followed by his disciples in deciding the controversial points concerning the Doctrine and the Discipline when they arose.[2] This method, elaborated in the commentaries, served as the canonical basis of the decision of controversial points (*vinicchayas*) in the orthodox school. According to the Buddha's method, whenever a new point of the Doctrine or the Discipline was mooted, it was to be tested in the light of both the Doctrine and the Discipline, and it was to be accepted as correct, if it could be harmonized with the underlying principles of both as laid down by him. One cannot fail to see that the Buddha's purpose was, as usual, to call attention to the essence or spirit of the thing, whereas the purpose of the *Aṭṭhakathā* method was to defend the sectarian standpoint of the Theravāda. Here the authority is the authority of the Suttas or canonical texts recognized as such by the three orthodox councils. These were to be regarded as the books of unquestionable authority, and in the lesser order of preference were to be treated as the auxiliary works (*suttānulomas*), the commentaries (*Aṭṭhakathās*) and the individual views of the teachers belonging to the Theravāda school (*attano mati*). Even the last one was to be used as the basis in preference to the texts, the appendices, the expositions and the views that belonged to other Buddhist

---

[1] *Netti*, pp. 5, 8, 9

[2] *Dīgha*, II, pp 123ff.

sects and schools of thought.[1] The essential point to be kept in view was whether the proposition offered was consistent or inconsistent with the path leading to deliverance (*vivaṭṭupanissita*) according to the Buddha's method. Although this point, too, is emphasized by Buddhaghosa here and there, it is more the letter than the spirit of a set of the authoritative texts passed as the Book by the Theras of old which has guided the course of orthodoxy in his expositions.

The *Aṭṭhakathā-naya* or scholastic method was required for discussion in the *nidāna* or general introduction of certain relevant historical points in connection with the text as a whole as well as each individual discourse or section. The explanation in a general or discursive or critical fashion, keeping both the formal (textual and linguistic) and the material (doctrinal and connotative) aspect in view was offered after it. The questionnaire to be answered in the *nidāna* is formulated in terms of *kena* (by whom?), *kattha* (where delivered?), *kadā* (when?), and *kasmā* (what for, for whom?). This varies according to the nature of the texts dealt with. Buddhaghosa in his *Atthasālinī* (p. 31) sets forth the following typical questionnaire:

'*Ayaṃ Abhidhammo nāma kena pabhāvito, kattha paripācito, kattha adhigato, kena adhigato, kattha vicito, kadā vicito, kena vicito, kattha desito, kass' atthāya desito, kehi patiggahīto, ke sikkhanti, ke sikkhitasikkhā, ke dhārenti, kassa vacanaṃ, kenābhatan ti?*.'

'By whom has this Abhidhamma been promulgated? Where has it matured? Where and by whom has it been mastered? Where, when and by whom has it been investigated? Where and for whose benefit has it been taught? By whom has it been accepted? Who are learning it? Who have learnt it? Who are getting it by heart? Whose word is it? By whom has it been brought?'

It goes without saying that the answers given are legendary, uncritical, orthodox and childish. It is at the second step that we notice seriousness and profoundness, although here also the etymological ingenuities often mar the beauty of the discussions. In explaining the texts Buddhaghosa supplies historical, geographical, biological, textual and doctrinal details, much of which is of interest and importance. It is necessary, however, to separate the grain from the husk. As to the texts themselves, the variants of readings and interpolations are noted with great care. For the stock passages the commentaries offer stereotyped explanations.

[1] *Samantapāsādikā*, I, pp. 230ff.

The rigidity of style and pedantry in the *Visuddhimagga* grow less and less as we come to the *Nikāya* and *Abhidhamma commentaries*, in which Buddhaghosa's prose style is found easy and lucid.

1. *Historical*: According to Buddhaghosa, the Buddha is known as *Dasabala* because he is possessed of ten powers which may be classified under two heads, physical strength and the strength of wisdom. One cannot be a Buddha only by physical strength because it forms the outward strength of a man which is considered insignificant. This strength cannot help a man for full comprehension of suffering, for abandoning the origin of suffering, for cultivation of the Path, and for the realization of the fruit. In order to become a *Tathāgata*, i.e. the Buddha, the powers which are characterized by stability and support and which are really the forces of wisdom, are helpful.[1] According to Buddhaghosa, the *Tathāgata* is described as the lion because he possessed the capacity of restraining himself from the worldly powers. He had the powers of putting down the views and theories propounded by other teachers. He was not afraid of anything in this world and was the most skilful amongst the members of eight assemblies of human and divine beings.[2]

Buddhaghosa refers to four kinds of Buddha: (1) the Buddha who has attained enlightenment by practising *pāramitā* (perfection); (2) self-dependent Buddha; (3) master of four truths; and (4) the learned Buddha, i.e. one who had heard much.[3]

As the previous Buddhas came for the welfare of all beings, so the Blessed Gotama came. As the previous Buddhas attained enlightenment by fulfilling the ten *pāramitās*, so the Buddha did. The Buddha destroyed desires for sensual pleasures by renunciation, malevolence by non-injurious desires, sloth and torpor by his right vision, doubt by the analysis and exposition of *dhamma*, and ignorance by his knowledge. He fully realized the true characteristics of the four elements. He also realized the four noble truths and dependent origination. He heard, knew, touched, tasted, and thought of all that was in existence in the human world as well as in the world of gods. What he preached and taught, was complete, correct and perfect in meaning and exposition and to the point. His action was in agreement with his speech and *vice versa*.[4]

---

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p 43.
[2] *Ibid*, II, p 46; cf *Papañcasūdani*, II, p 27.
[3] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 25
[4] *Papañcasūdani*, I, pp 45–51; cf. *Sumangalavilāsinī*, I, pp 59–68.

The *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* records the reasons for calling the Buddha the *Tathāgata*.[1] The Buddha had to perform fivefold duties: (1) duties before meal, (2) duties after meal, (3) duties in the first watch, (4) duties in the middle watch, and (5) duties in the last watch of the night.

(1) Duties before meal included the following:—Ablution early in the morning and sitting alone till the time of begging; at the time of begging alms to robe himself; tying his waist with belt and taking his alms-bowl on going for alms sometimes alone, sometimes accompanied by the *bhikkhusaṅgha* in villages or towns, sometimes in natural posture, and sometimes by showing miracles, e.g. wind cleaning the street which he was to traverse. To preach to the *dāyakas* (alms-givers) according to their intelligence; and to return thereafter to the *vihāra* and to enter the Gandhakūṭi after the return of all the bhikkhus from the begging-tour.

(2) As to the duties after meal: His attendant used to prepare seat for him in the Gandhakūti and he after sitting on it, used to wash his feet. Standing on the step of the staircase of the Gandhakūṭi, he used to instruct the bhikkhus to perform their duties diligently. He spoke thus, 'The appearance of the Buddha is rare, it is difficult to be born as a human being, good opportunity is also difficult to be obtained, ordination as bhikkhus is also difficult to be had, and the hearing of the *Saddhamma* (Good Law) is also difficult to be obtained.' Some of the bhikkhus used to seek his instructions in *kammaṭṭhānas* (objects of meditation). The Blessed One used to give instructions in the *kammaṭṭhānas* suitable to their nature. The bhikkhus used to return to their dwelling-place or to the forest after saluting the Buddha. Some used to return to the *Cātummahārājika Heaven* or to the *Paranimmitavasavattī Heaven*.[2] After giving instructions, the Blessed One used to enter the Gandhakūṭi and lie down on the right side. He used to see the world with his eye of wisdom after refreshing himself. He then used to give instructions to the people who assembled in the Preaching hall with scented flowers, etc., and then the people after listening to the religious instructions, used to return after saluting the Buddha.

(3) In the first watch of the night if he desired to bathe, he used to get up from his seat and enter the bath-room and bathed himself with water supplied by the attendant who made ready the seat for him in the Gandhakūṭi. He used to

[1] *Sumangalavilāsinī*, I, pp 59–68.

[2] See my book, *Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective*, pp. 7, 15, etc

put on red coloured undergarment tying his waist with belt. Then he used to put on the upper garment keeping one shoulder bare, and thereafter to sit on his seat alone in the mood of meditation. The bhikkhus used to come to worship him. Some bhikkhus used to ask him questions, some to ask for instructions in *kammaṭṭhāna*, and some to request him to give religious instructions. The Buddha used to satisfy the bhikkhus by fulfilling their desires. Thus he used to spend the first watch of the night.

(4) Duties in the middle watch: After the bhikkhus had left him, the *devatās* used to come from 10,000 *lokadhātus* (world cycles), and the Blessed One used to spend the middle watch in answering the questions of the *devas*.

(5) Duties in the last watch of the night: The last watch of the night was divided into three parts. He used to spend the first part by walking up and down, the second part by lying down on the right-hand side in the Gandhakūṭi, and the last part by seeing with his eyes the person who acquired competency in knowing *dhamma* on account of the acquisition of merit by serving the previous Buddhas.[1]

Anuruddha was the foremost among the theras who had the Divine Eye.[2] Piṇḍola Bharadvāja was one of the eminent bhikkhus. He was well versed in the three *Vedas* and afterwards became an Arahat.[3] Mahākaccāna was the foremost among the theras who could fully explain the brief utterances of the *Tathāgata*.[4] Revata who was the younger brother of Sāriputra, attained arahatship.[5] Vaṅgīsa was born in a Brahmin family. He was versed in the three *Vedas*. He was reckoned as the foremost of those possessed of intelligence or ready wit.[6] Puṇṇa was the son of a Brahmin named Mantāni. He was born in a Brahmin family. He received ordination and in due course attained arahatship. He was one of the foremost of the bhikkhus.[7] Kumāra Kassapa was reckoned as the foremost of the wise speakers, orators or preachers.[8] Mahākoṭṭhita was the foremost among those who possessed analytical knowledge. He received ordination and attained arahatship through his analytical knowledge.[9] Ānanda was the foremost among those who were vastly learned in the Doctrine. He was the personal attendant of the Buddha and attained arahatship.[10] Uruvela Kassapa

---

1 *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, I, pp. 45–48
2 *Manorathapūrani*, I, Pt I, pp 183–192.
3 *Ibid*, pp. 196–199.
4 *Ibid.*, pp 204–9.
5 *Ibid*, pp 223–230
6 *Ibid.*, pp 266–270, cf. *Sāratthappakāsini*, I, pp 285-6.
7 *Ibid.*, pp. 199–204.
8 *Ibid*, pp 283–5
9 *Ibid.*, pp. 285-6
10 *Manorathapūrani*, I, Pt. I, pp. 286–296

was the foremost of those who had many followers. He became an arahat. He was an ascetic of the Jaṭila sect.[1] Upāli was the foremost of those who knew the Vinaya rules. He was a barber. He with Anuruddha, Ānanda and others visited the Buddha with the intention of becoming monks. They asked for admission into the Order and in order to curb their pride, they requested that the barber should be first ordained and their request was granted.[2] The *Manorathapūraṇī* also contains an interesting account of the *Therīs*. The attention of the readers may be drawn to my work *Women in Buddhist Literature*, Chapter VIII, which supplies the account of the *Therīs* based on this commentary. Mallikā was the chief queen of Udena of Kosambī. She was the daughter of a poor garland-maker. One day while returning home after purchasing a cake from a shop she found the Blessed One going on alms. She offered the cake to the Master who accepted it. When Ānanda asked him about the merit of this gift, Buddha replied that she would be the chief queen of Kosala on that very day.[3] Migāramātā was born as the daughter of a banker named Dhanañjaya. She was named Visākhā She was married to the son of a Sāvatthian banker named Migāra, who used to call his daughter-in-law mother. So she was named Migāramātā.[4] Kisāgotamī was given in marriage to the son of a Sāvatthian banker. The banker was very much pleased with her thinking that her very presence was the cause of turning the charcoal into gold.[5] Jīvaka, the celebrated physician in Buddha's time, was born as the son of a courtesan of Rājagaha named Sālavatī. He was thrown into a dustbin. He was reared up by Prince Abhaya. He out of devotion towards the Blessed One built a monastery and presented it to the Saṅgha headed by the Buddha.[6] Kassapa was his personal name. Buddha asked his followers to call Kassapa. They asked him as to which Kassapa the Master wanted to see. The Blessed One then named him as Kumāra Kassapa.[7] Purana Kassapa was so named because with his birth, the number of slaves in the family reached hundred. He fled from his master's house and on the way was robbed of his clothes by thieves. He entered a village being naked. He afterwards renounced the household life.[8] Makkhali Gosāla was born in a cow-shed and hence he was

[1] *Manorathapūraṇī*, pp 297–300
[2] *Ibid*, pp 311-312
[3] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p 140
[4] *Ibid.*, I, p. 148
[5] *Ibid.*, I, p 190.
[6] *Papañcasūdanī*, III, pp 45-6
[7] *Ibid.*, II, p. 120.
[8] *Ibid.*, II, p 233; cf. *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 130.

called Gosāla.[1] Ajitakesakambalī was a heretical teacher. He was called Kesakambalī because he used blankets made of human hair.[2] Pakudha Kaccāna always used hot or tepid water. He considered it a sin to cross a river.[3] Bimbisāra was called Māgadha because he was the king of Magadha. He was called Bimbisāra because he was possessed of the beauty and prosperity of the body.[4]

According to Buddhaghosa, Ajātasattu was even before his birth an enemy of Bimbisāra. The circumstances, as recorded in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, are no doubt shocking. The queen believing that the child in her womb would be an enemy to the king tried to effect miscarriage, but she was prevented from doing so by the king urging that a sinful act would be abhorred by the people of Jambudīpa and that voluntary abortion was against the national tradition of India. The queen thought of destroying the child at the time of delivery but in vain. Maternal affection towards the child got the upperhand and she could not kill him. In due course the king made him his Vice-regent.[5] Ajātasattu took advantage of it and kept his father confined in a room. Nobody was allowed to visit him except the queen who was afterwards prevented from doing so. The queen inspite of the prohibitive injunction used to bring food for her husband concealing it in several parts of her body. She was one day found out and ordered not to enter the room with any kind of food. Bimbisāra got some sustenance by licking her body. This too was detected by the over-vigilant Ajātasattu. She was forbidden to enter into the room and asked to see the king from outside. Bimbisāra was thus prevented from taking any food but he was still alive. The commentator informs us that the inhuman practices of Ajātasattu increased in their barbarity.[6] Bimbisāra breathed his last with the words '*Buddha and Dhamma*' and afterwards born in the *Cātummahārājika Heaven*.[7] On the day Bimbisāra died, a son was born to Ajātasattu. When Ajātasattu received the news of the birth of his son, filial affection arose in him. He ordered the release of his father but it was too late. He afterwards repented.[8]

Sundarika Bhāradvāja was a Brahmin belonging to the Bharadvāja gotra. He was of opinion that a dip in the river Sundarikā would remove all sins committed by a man.[9]

---

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 233, *ibid.*, I, p 130.
[2] *Ibid*, II, p 233
[3] *Ibid.*, II, pp 233-4.
[4] *Sumaṅgala v*, I, p 280.
[5] *Sumangalavilāsini*, I, p 134
[6] *Ibid*, I, pp 135-136
[7] *Ibid*, I, p 137
[8] *Ibid*, I, pp 138ff
[9] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p 177, cf *Sāratthappakāsini*, I, p. 233.

The *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* speaks of the origin of the Sākyas which is traced back to king Okkāka (Ikṣvāku). King Okkāka had five queens. He had four sons and five daughters by his chief queen. After the death of the chief queen, the king married another young lady who extorted from him the promise to place her son upon the throne. The king thereupon requested his sons to leave the kingdom. The princes accordingly left the kingdom accompanied by their sisters. They went to a forest near the Himalayas and began to search for a site for building a city. In course of their search they met the sage Kapila who said that they should build a town close to his dwelling place. The town was built and was named Kapilavatthu. The four brothers married the four sisters excepting the eldest one and they came to be known as the Sākyas.[1]

2. *Geographical:* Sāvatthī was the place where Buddha used to go on alms. The city was so called because it contained the abode of the sage Savattha. As everything was available there, the name of the city was Sāvatthī.[2] Jetavana was the place where Buddha lived.[3] As regards Tapodārāma, the ārāma was so called because it had a lake the water of which was hot. At the foot of the Vebhāra hill there was an abode of the Nāgas. There were two hells round Rājagaha and the river flowed through these hells, hence the water became hot. Tapoda is the name of the stream which flowed into and fed the Tapoda lake.[4] Buddhaghosa explains Giribbaja as meaning an enclosure of hills.[5] As it stood like a cattle-fold surrounded on all sides by mountains, it was called Giribbaja.[6] Giribbaja may, therefore, be taken to mean a 'hill-girt' city. The commentator refers to the city of Rājagaha (inner and outer).[7] The Deer Park at Maddakucchi was an important site near Rājagaha. Buddhaghosa takes it to be the actual name of the park where the antelopes were allowed to live freely. The path came to acquire the name Maddakucchi (rubbed belly) from the circumstance that here Bimbisāra's queen tried to cause abortion with a view to killing the inimical child in the womb by getting her belly rubbed.[8] Paṭibhānakūṭa was a boundary rock which looked like a mountain.[9] Indakūṭa (Indrakūṭa) hill which is in the neighbourhood of Rājagaha derived its name from the yakkha or the yakkha derived his name from the hill.[10]

---

[1] *Sumangalavilāsini*, I, pp 258–260, cf. *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p 68.
[2] *Papañcasūdani*, I, p. 59.
[3] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p 13.
[4] *Ibid*, I, p 38.
[5] *Ibid.*, II, p 159.
[6] *Papañcasūdani*, I, p. 151.
[7] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 313
[8] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 77.
[9] *Ibid*, Siamese Ed., III, p 413.
[10] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 300.

The Sanskrit *Indraka* is an architectural term, meaning 'a council hall'. It might be that the abode of the yakkha concerned was just a hall-like stone structure marked by the presence of a sacred tree. Sappinī occurs as the name of a river or rivulet in the neighbourhood of Rājagaha. It, as its name implies, was a stream with a winding course. Buddha used to sojourn occasionally on its bank.[1] A Buddhist establishment was founded at Ekanālā in Dakkhiṇagiri. Ekanālā was a Brahmin village in Dakkhiṇagiri, an important locality which lay to the south of the hills of Rājagaha.[2] The history of the Vepulla mountain is to be traced from an intermediate period when the vertebrates proper had not appeared in this earth (*Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, 158). Mahāvana was a natural forest, the trees of which grew up naturally and they were not planted. This big forest stretched in a line with the Himalayas without any break (*ibid.*, I, p. 67). Aggāḷava cetiya was the chief shrine of Āḷavi. Before the advent of the Buddha the Aggāḷava and Gotamaka-shrines were inhabited by the yakkhas and nāgas. When the Buddha was born, they were driven out by men who built many monasteries there (*Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 268). The Mandākinī pond lay in the Chaddantavana and was fifty yojanas in extent. The half of this pond contained transparent water and the water of the other half was waist deep and was full of white lotuses (*ibid.*, I, pp. 280ff.). Gayā has been described as a village (*ibid.*, I, p. 302). Gaṅgā and Yamunā are referred to as great rivers (*ibid.*, II, p. 54). The city of Suṃsumāragiri in the territory of the Bhaggas was so named because when it was being built, an alligator made a sound and after the voice of the alligator the city got its name (*ibid.*, II, p. 249). Badarikārāma stood at a distance of one *gāvuta*[3] from the Gositārāma (*ibid.*, II, p. 316). The mango-grove of Ambapālī, a famous courtesan of Vaiśālī, contained a monastery built by Ambapālī who dedicated it to the Buddha whose doctrine she adopted when she heard the Master preaching it (*ibid.*, III, p. 177). In the city of Nālandā there was a mango-grove called Pāvārika-ambavana. A merchant who was the owner of this grove, became devoted to the Buddha when he heard the latter preaching *Dhamma*. The mango-grove was handed over to the Buddha for the use of the Saṅgha (*ibid.*, III, p. 207). Añjanavana was so called

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, 219, *Sappinī-nāmikāya nadiyā tīre*

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 242; *Dakkhinagirismin Rājagaham parivāretvā ṭhitassa girino dakkhinabhāge janapado atthi Tasmim janapade tattha vihārassāpi tad eva nāman .. Ekanālā ti tassagāmassa nāmaṃ*

[3] A little less than two miles.

because the flowers of the garden were collyrium-coloured (*ibid.*, III, p. 247). The way to Upavattana, the sāla grove of the Mallas, lay on the other side of the river Hiraññavatī (*ibid.*, I, p. 222). The people of Ayujjhanagara built for the Buddha a *vihāra* in a spot surrounded by a forest near the curve of the river Sarayū (*ibid.*, II, pp. 233-4). Sukarakhata was a cave. It was made during the time of Kassapa Buddha. In course of time it was buried in the earth. A pig dug the earth near it. After a shower of rain the earth was washed out and the cave became exposed. A forester (*vanacaraka*) saw it and removed the earth round it. He cleaned the cave, fenced it, built its doors and windows and furnished it with all the requisites. He then handed it over to the Buddha for his residence (*Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, p. 249). The Salaḷāgāra hermitage was so named because it was full of sweet scented salaḷa trees. According to the commentator it got its name from the fact that the salala tree stood at its gate (*ibid.*, p. 263). The city of Vaiśālī was so named because it grew big in size by the walls which went round the city thrice.[1] The Rajakārāma monastery was so called because it was built by king Pasenadi of Kosala.[2] Isipatana was so called because the sages on their way through the air got down here or started from this place. On their aerial journey, on the Gandhamādanapabbata, paccekabuddhas having spent seven days in contemplation bathed in the Anotatta lake and came to the human habitation through the air.[3]

The city of Ukkaṭṭhā was so named because it was built by the light of the torches at night so that it could be completed within the auspicious time.[4] Subhagavana at Ukkaṭṭhā was a beautiful wood. On account of the romantic nature of its surroundings, people used to go there for festivities.[5] Buddhaghosa refers to Payāga as a *ghāṭ* of the Ganges. Here the palace occupied by king Mahāpanāda was submerged.[6] Bāhukā, Sundarikā, Sarassatī and Bāhumatī are described as four rivers, none of them was of any use for internal purification.[7] The region where the people of Pubbavideha lived in former times came to be known as the Videha kingdom. The region where the people of Aparagoyāna and Uttarakuru formerly lived came to be known as the kingdoms of Aparānta and Kuru respectively.[8]

Kammāsadhamma was a town of the Kurus. According to Buddhaghosa this town was spelt differently as Kammāsa-

---

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, p 265.
[2] *Ibid.*, III, p. 283
[3] *Ibid.*, III, p. 296
[4] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p. 10.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, p. 11.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, p. 178.
[7] *Ibid.*, I, p. 178.
[8] *Ibid.*, I, p. 225

dhamma and Kammāsadamma. He offers an explanation for the name of ogre Kammāsa who was also called Kammāsa-pāda. Kammāsa was the actual name. The element *pāda* was added to his name because of the wound he once received which when healed up, left a scar like a piece of well-grained timber.[1] Buddhaghosa describes the Himalayan region to be 3,000 yojanas in extent.[2] The Gijjhakūṭa mountain was so called because the shape of its peak was like that of a vulture. Buddhaghosa gives another explanation. The mountain was so called because the peak was the abode of the vultures. The ridge of a black rock stood by the side of the Isigili mountain.[3]

Vesālī was so named because of the successive increase in its size.[4] The Vajji territory was thrice increased by one *gāvuta* each time. As it was increased again and again the city came to be known as Vesālī.[5] Kapilavatthu was so named because the sage Kapila lived here. The Sākyas are said to have built their city and named it after the sage Kapila.[6] Suṃsumāragiri was a city in the Bhagga country and its capital was so called because, on the very first day of its construction, a crocodile made a noise in a lake near by.[7]

According to Buddhaghosa Migadāya was so called because it stood at the place where assurance of fearlessness and safety was given to beasts and birds.[8]

Rājagaha (lit. the abode of kings) was so called because it was the residence of the kings like Mandhātā, Mahāgovinda. According to another tradition it was a human habitation during the time of the Buddhas while at other times the city was deserted and turned into an abode of the demons.[9] Rājagaha stood at a distance of 60 yojanas from Kapilavatthu and 15 yojanas from Sāvatthī.[10] Kalandakanivāpa was a woodland at Veluvana. It was so called because food was regularly given here to the squirrels. It is said that an ancient king once came here for sports and being overdrunk fell asleep. Seeing him asleep his followers went out in search of fruit. A cobra being attracted by the smell of liquor began to approach the king. Seeing the imminent danger of the king, a tree spirit assumed the form of a squirrel, and roused the king by its chirping. The king awoke and saw how his life was saved by a squirrel. He then gave orders that henceforth the squirrels of that locality would be

---

1 *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p. 226.
2 *Ibid*, II, p. 6
3 *Ibid*, II, p. 63.
4 *Ibid*, II, pp. 19 foll.
5 *Ibid.*, II, pp. 19 foll.
6 *Ibid*, II, p 61.
7 *Ibid.*, II, p. 65
8 *Ibid*, II, p 65
9 *Ibid.*, II, p. 134.
10 *Ibid.*, II, p. 152.

regularly fed. The place therefore came to be known as Kalandakanivāpa.[1]

Before the advent of the Buddha, the Paccekabuddhas spent a week on the Gandhamādana mountain in meditation. Rising up from meditation they washed their faces at Anotatta lake, took their garments and alms-bowls and then they came through the sky and got down at Isipatana. They then went back to Gandhamādana mountain after taking their food which they received on begging. The place was called Isipatana because the sages on their way through the air came down here and left this place for their Himalayan abode.[2]

The distance from Buddhagayā to Gayā was three *gāvutas*.[3]

Nādikā is described as a pond near which stood a village known by the same name.[4] Gosiṅgasālavana was a forest tract near Nādikā. According to Buddhaghosa, the forest was so called because the branches grew up, like the horns of a cow, from the trunk of a big sāla tree which stood in this forest.[5] Mahāvana was a big natural wood at Vaiśālī. It stretched in a line from Kapilavatthu to the Himalayan region and therefrom to the sea. It was marked by a boundary.[6] The territory of Aṅga was named after its princes who were also known as the Aṅgas.[7] The country of Kosala was the abode of Kosalan princes. Buddhaghosa gives a curious explanation of the origin of its name. It is said that when nothing could make the prince Mahāpanāda smile, his father offered a handsome reward for him who could do this. People came to the king's palace and tried in vain to please Mahāpanāda. After seven long years Sakka sent a celestial actor who was successful in making him smile. After this men started going back to their respective homes and on the way meeting friends and relations began to ask, 'How do you do? Are you all right?' The place where this took place came to be called Kosala on account of the repetition of the word '*Kusala*'.[8]

Buddhaghosa offers two explanations for the name of Kosambī: (1) it was so called because Kosamba trees grew in plenty in and around the country; and (2) the city was so called because it was built near the hermitage of the saint Kusāmba.[9] Ghositārāma was built by a banker named Ghosita. In the past there was a kingdom named Addila.

---

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 134 [2] *Ibid.*, II, p. 188

[3] *Ibid.*, II, p. 188—One *gāvuta* = a little less than two miles

[4] *Ibid.*, II, p. 235 [5] *Ibid.*, II, p. 235. [6] *Ibid.*, II, p. 267

[7] *Ibid.*, II, p. 312. [8] *Ibid.*, II, 326. [9] *Ibid.*, II, pp. 389-90.

In this kingdom a poor man named Kotūhaḷaka while going to another place at the time of famine, being unable to carry his son, threw him on the way. The mother out of affection went back and brought the child and returned to the village of *gopālas* (cowherds) who gave them milk-rice to eat. The child could not digest the milk and died at night of cholera and was reborn in the womb of a bitch. The young dog was the favourite of the head of the cowherds, who used to worship a *Paccekabuddha*. The cowherd used to give a handful of cooked rice to the young dog which followed the *gopālas* to the hermitage of the *Paccekabuddha*. The young dog used to inform the *Paccekabuddha* by barking that rice was ready and used to drive away wild beasts on the way by barking. As the young dog served the *Paccekabuddha*, he was reborn after death in heaven and was named Ghosadevaputta who, fallen from heaven, was reborn in a family at Kosambī. The banker of Kosambī being childless brought him up and when a legitimate child was born to the banker, he attempted to kill Ghosaka seven times but on account of the accumulation of merit Ghosaka could not be killed. He was saved by the instrumentality of a banker's daughter whom he eventually married. After the death of the banker who attempted to kill him, he succeeded him and was known as Ghosakaseṭṭhi. At Kosambī there were two other bankers named Kukkuṭa and Pāvāriya. At this time five hundred ascetics came to Kosambī and the three bankers, Ghosaka, Kukkuṭa, and Pāvāriya built hermitages in their respective gardens for the ascetics and supported them. Once the ascetics while coming from the Himalayan region through a forest became very hungry and thirsty, and sat under a big banian tree thinking that there must have been a powerful *devatā* residing in the tree who would surely help them. The presiding deity of the tree helped the ascetics with water to quench their thirst. The deity when asked as to how he (deity) acquired such splendour, replied that he was a servant in the house of a banker Anāthapiṇḍika who supported the Buddha at Jetavana. On a sabbath day the servant went out to walk in the morning and returned in the evening. He enquired of the other servants of the house and learning that they had accepted *uposatha*, he went to Anāthapiṇḍika and took precepts. But he could not observe the precepts fully and in consequence of the merit accumulated due to the observance of half the *uposatha* at night, he became the deity of this tree endowed with great splendour. They went to Kosambī and informed the *seṭṭhis* of this matter. The ascetics went to the Buddha and acquired ordination and arahatship. The

seṭṭhis afterwards went to the Buddha and invited the Buddha to Kosambī. After returning to Kosambī, they built three hermitages and one of them was known as Ghositārāma.[1]

The Porāṇas say that prince Mahāpanāda did not laugh even after seeing or hearing objects that are likely to rouse laughter. The father of the prince promised that he would decorate with various kinds of ornaments the person who would be able to make his son laugh. Many, including even the cultivators, gave up their ploughs and came to make the son laugh. They tried in various ways but in vain. At last, Sakka the chief of the gods, sent a theatrical party to show him a celestial drama to make the prince laugh. The prince laughed and men returned to their respective abodes. While they were returning home they were asked on the way, '*Kacci bho kusalaṃ, kacci bho kusalam*' (Are you all right?). From this word *kusalaṃ*, the country came to be known as Kosala.[2]

According to Buddhaghosa, Campaka trees were in abundance in the city of Campā. The lake Gaggarā was near the city. It was dug by the queen Gaggarā. On its banks there was a large grove of Campaka trees famous for their sweetly scented flowers. Buddha stayed here on many occasions.[3] The small village of Veluva stood near Vesālī towards the south of this city.[4] Uttarāpa was the region which lay to the north of the river Mahī. This region was also known as Aṅguttara, because it formed a part of Aṅgadesa on the other side of the river Mahī.

Jambudīpa was 10,000 yojanas in area. Of this vast area, 4,000 yojanas were covered with water and in the area of 3,000 yojanas people used to live. On an area of 3,000 yojanas stood the Himalaya mountain which was 5 yojanas in breadth and adorned with 84,000 peaks and 500 rivers. In the Himalaya region lay seven big lakes, covering an area of more than 2,000 yojanas. The lakes were Kaṇṇamuṇḍa, Anotatta, Rathakāra, Chaddanta, Kuṇāla, Mandākinī and Sīhappapāta. Of these the Anotatta was surrounded by five hills and mountains, e.g. Sudassana, Citrakūṭa, Kālakūṭa, Gandhamādana and Kailāsa. Sudassanakūṭa, which was of golden colour, stood covering the Anotatta lake. The Citrakūṭa was covered with all kinds of jewels; while the Kālakūṭa was as black as collyrium. The Gandhamādana range was crowned with a table-land and its

[1] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, pp. 317–319.
[2] *Ibid*, I, p. 239
[3] *Papañcasūdanī*, III, p. 1.
[4] *Ibid.*, III, 12.

colour was green. It contained many kinds of medicinal herbs (*Papañcasūdanī*, III, 34).

Pāvārika-ambavana was a mango-grove belonging to a banker named Pāvārika of Nālandā, which was used as a pleasure grove. Pāvārika built a monastery here, being pleased with the Master, after listening to his discourse. He dedicated it to the congregation of monks headed by the Buddha (*ibid.*, III, 52).

Koliya was so called because it was the abode of the Koliyan princes (III, 100). The town of Haliddavasana was so called because at the time when it was being built, men in yellow dress observed the *nakkhatta* festival which was a ceremony held to observe a particular auspicious star or stars (III, 100). Makhādeva-ambavana was made by king Makhādeva of Videha (III, 309). The palace of the prince Bodhi called Kokanada was built in the design of a hanging lotus (III, 321). There was a monastery in the Nigrodhārāma surrounded by a wall and fitted with doors and windows and adorned with a dining hall, a pavilion, etc. (IV, 155).

Majjhimadesa which belonged to the Jambudīpa was 300 yojanas in length, 250 yojanas in breadth, and 900 yojanas in circumference. It was the abode of the Buddhas, Paccekabuddhas, senior disciples, 80 great disciples of the Buddha, paramount sovereigns, and many eminent Brahmin and Khatriya householders (*Papañcasūdanī*, IV, 172). Tapodārāma was so called because of the hot water lake situated in it. At the foot of the Vebhāra hill there was a big abode of serpents comprising an area of 500 yojanas. At that place there was a big lake in which serpents indulged in sportive amusements. From that lake flowed the river Tapodā, the water of which was hot (V, 4-5). The rivers named Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Aciravatī, Sarabhū and Mahī take their rise from the Anotatta lake (II, 586—Sinhalese Ed.).

3. *Biological*: Buddhaghosa had knowledge of the animal kingdom. He appreciates the beauty of bird-life and the effect of the sweet songs of birds on human mind. The *Manorathapūraṇī* mentions pigeons (pārevatā).[1] Birds' nests are seen to hang from old granaries.[2] The mariner's crow knows the quarters of the globe. It stands on the mast-top of a boat and rises up into the sky. It then goes to all the quarters but afterwards takes a certain direction in order to see the shore. If it does not see it, it returns and alights on the mast-top.[3] An Indian cuckoo, seeing another cuckoo

[1] Vol. II, p. 258.
[2] *Visuddhimagga*, 357.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 657.

near by, usually sings sweet songs.[1] Buddhaghosa refers to owls which live in dark places and caves.

Buddhaghosa refers to a kind of deer called Kadali miga, the skin of which is used as a covering.[2] Such animals as bulls (*puṅgava*)[3] and goats (*ajina*),[4] the skin of which is used in making garments, lions, tigers, leopards, bears, dogs, elephants, oxen and snakes are mentioned in his commentaries (*Visuddhimagga*, 645). According to Buddhaghosa there are four kinds of lions: (1) grass-eating lion, (2) black lion, (3) light yellow lion, and (4) lion with mane. The grass-eating lion has the colour of its skin like that of a greyish blue cow. The black lion also lives on grass. The third one which lives on flesh has its body as big as a cow and the colour of its skin is like that of a withered leaf. The last one has got a red face, a tail and four feet, three red stripes running from above its head down to the middle of the back and then turning towards the right come to an end between the thighs. On the shoulders lie the manes. The rest of the body is as white as the crushed *sālī* seed or the conch-shell dust or the cotton.[5] The commentator mentions four kinds of snakes: (1) wooden-mouthed, (2) putrid-mouthed, (3) fire-mouthed, and (4) weapon-mouthed. The body of a man bitten by a wooden-mouthed snake becomes stiff like a piece of dry wood. The body of one bitten by a putrid-mouthed snake, becomes festered and flows down like a rotten ripe jack-fruit. If a human body is bitten by a fire-faced snake, it becomes burnt and strewn over in the air like ashes. If a weapon-faced serpent bites a man, his body is destroyed like a place struck by a thunder.[6]

The donkey follows the herd of cattle.[7] All white elephants, rhinoceros and wild horse are mentioned by Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga*.[8] The mountain-cow is foolish, inexperienced and does not know its pasture field. It is stupid in roaming about in the uneven mountain places.[9]

Buddhaghosa's knowledge of the vegetable kingdom[10] is evidenced by his mention of the five classes into which it is divided. In his *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* he refers to them as roots, stump, joint, budding, seed or grafting.[11] He also mentions such trees as Pāṭali (*Bignonia Suaveolens*) which is called trumpet flower,[12] Sāla (*Shorea robusta*), Sirīsa[13] (*Acacia sirissa*),

1 *Visuddhimagga*, p. 112
2 *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, 325
3 *Manorathapūranī*, II, 258.
4 *Ibid*, II, 293
5 *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p 283.
6 *Ibid.*, III, p 6.
7 *Visuddhimagga*, p. 54.
8 pp. 234, 490 and 650.
9 *Ibid*, p. 153
10 *Visuddhimagga*, p 688
11 Vol. I, p 77; cf. *Sāratthappakāsinī*, I, p. 250
12 *Sumangalavilāsinī*, II, 415; cf *Milinda*, p. 338.
13 Cf. *Vis.*, p. 206

Udumbara (fig tree, *Ficus Glomerata*), Nigrodha [1] (banyan tree, *Ficus Indica*) and Assattha (*Ficus Religiosa*).[2] There is a description of Sāla trees surrounding a village which appeared like a fence.[3] Buddhaghosa also refers to Kovilāra (a sort of ebony, *Bauhinia variegata*),[4] Pāricchattaka [5] (coral tree, *Erythmia Indica*) and Palāsa [6] (*Butea frondosa* or Judas tree). There is a mention of a soft tree (*mudurukkha*) which grows in an island in the mid-Ganges.[7] There is a reference to trees, the flowers of which have the colour of collyrium (*añjana*).[8] In his *Manorathapūraṇī*,[9] Buddhaghosa mentions a kind of tree called Gaṇdamba, at the foot of which the Master performed the double miracle. Buddhaghosa mentions Jambu tree [10] (rose-apple tree, *Eugenia Jambolana*), Kadamba tree (*Nauclea cordifolia*—with orange-coloured, fragrant blossoms), Citta-Pāṭali [11] which signifies that the Pāṭali tree is variegated and beautiful.[12]

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions Simbalirukkha which is called a silk cotton tree,[13] and Madhuka (*Bassia latifolia*).[14] We find mention of two kinds of flowers in the *Visuddhimagga*, viz. Ākuli [15] and Kaṇikāra. The Kanikāra are the flowers of the tree called *Pterospermum acerifolium*.[16]

Buddhaghosa refers to a poisonous tree without mentioning its name in the *Visuddhimagga* [17] and to the Māluva creeper in the *Papañcasūdanī*.[18] Buddhaghosa mentions castor oil plants (*elaṇdā*).[19] The following flowers are mentioned in the *Papañcasūdanī*: Nīla-Kuruṇḍaka, Bandhujīvaka and Kaṇikāra.[20] The Pucimanda tree, i.e. Neem tree occurs in the Papañcasūdanī.[21] The plant *Pentapetes Phoenicece* has flowers called Bandhujīvaka.[22] Buddhaghosa mentions two kinds of forests: one in which the trees and plants were planted and another in which they grew up spontaneously. The Andhavana, Mahāvana, Añjanavana

---

1 Cf *Manorathapūranī*, I, 322, where there is a reference to a big banyan tree standing on the bank of the river Candabhāgā

2 *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, II, p 416.

3 *Ibid.*, II, p 395.

4 *Papañcasūdanī*, II, pp. 371-72.

5 *Visuddhimagga*, p 206.

6 *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, II, 649

7 *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, 37.

8 *Ibid*, III, 247

9 Vol. I, p 125.

10 *Visuddhimagga*, *P T S.*, p 206—its trunk is fifteen yojanas in girth and its height is very great

11 *Vis.*, p 206.

12 *Manorathapūranī*, II, pp 34-5.

13 *Vis*, p. 206.

14 p. 260

15 p 260.

16 *Vis*, p. 256

17 *Visuddhimagga*, p. 489.

18 II, 371-372—Māluvā is a long creeper. Cf. *Majjhima*, I, 306

19 *Papañcasūdanī*, II, 98.

20 I, 167.

21 II, 372.

22 Cf *Majjhima*, II, 14, *Dīgha*, II, 111; *Visuddhimagga*, 174.

and Subhagavana were artificial forests. The Jetavana and Veluvana were natural forests.[1]

As has already been pointed out, Buddhaghosa had a fair knowledge of anatomy. In his works[2] he has given an interesting account of the 32 parts of the human body. *Kesa* is the hair of the head. According to the commentator, it is an impurity in colour, form and smell. *Loma* is the hair of the body; it is of mixed colour, a combination of black and reddish yellow. There are nails of the 20 fingers which are white in colour and they are like fish-scales in shape. Naturally there are 32 teeth but occasionally there are exceptions. The four middle teeth of the lower gum are like the seed of a gourd sown on a ball of soft clay. On each side of the four middle teeth, there are two that have one root and one top and in size they resemble the buds of the *Mallikā* flower. On both sides of these two teeth again, there are two which have two roots and two tops and in shape they resemble the support of a cart. The skin of the body covers the whole body. If the skin of the body be so contracted as to form one lump, it will resemble the stone of a plum. The skin of the body is white in colour. The skin of toes is like a scabbard in shape. The skin of the knee is like a rice-plate or palm-leaf. The skin of the thigh is like a bag full of rice. The flesh is composed of nine hundred lumps. All the lumps of flesh are red. The flesh of the hinder parts is like the top of a furnace. The flesh of the back is like a lump of jaggery. The flesh of the breast resembles a covered lump of clay. All the muscles are white in colour and are of various shapes. There are twenty big muscles, five on the left, five on the right, five on the back and five in the front. There are ten muscles in each hand, five in the front and five at the back. There are sixty big muscles in the whole body. There are smaller and still smaller muscles. The muscles of the different parts of the body have different shapes. There are three hundred bones in the human body including sixty-four bones of the hands, sixty-two of the feet, sixty-four short bones mixed with flesh, two bones of the palms of the hands, four bones of the heels, two leg bones, two knee bones, two thigh bones, two waist bones, eighteen backbones, twenty-four side bones, fourteen chest bones, one bone of the heart, two eye bones, two bones of the arms, four bones of the forearms, seven bones of the neck, two bones of the jaw, one bone of the nose, two collar bones, two ear bones, one bone of the fore-

[1] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p 11

[2] *Visuddhimagga*, I, pp 249–256, 353–363, *Sammohavinodanī* (Sinhalese Ed), pp. 49–63

head, one bone of the head and nine bones of the skull. There is a marrow of three hundred bones. Its colour is white. There is a pair of lumps of flesh combined in one stalk. Its colour is slightly red. It remains all round the flesh of the heart. The two lumps of flesh are connected by a big nerve coming down from the neck. The big nerve is divided into two parts. There is the flesh of the heart. Inside the heart there is a hole as big as a nut. The heart is situated between two breasts. The liver stands between the two breasts close to the right one. The pleura is of two kinds covered and uncovered. The covered one is on the upper part of the body. The uncovered one extends all over the body just below the skin. The spleen exists on the left side of the heart, close to the topmost part of the flesh of the stomach. The flesh of the lungs is divided into thirty-two pieces. The interior of it is dry and it exists between the two breasts. The intestine remains coiled in twenty-one places. It stretches from the neck to the excretal passage. There are small intestines. They spring up from the place where the larger intestines remain coiled up. There are things which are accumulated in the stomach by eating, drinking, fasting, and so forth. Outwardly the stomach is very smooth. Its inside is rough. There are thirty-two kinds of germs in the stomach. The food which is put into the stomach is utilized in five ways, one portion of it is eaten up by the germs, one portion is burnt by the fire of the stomach, one portion turns into urine, one portion turns into excreta and the remaining portion is reduced to juice which produces flesh and blood. There are excrement and marrows inside the skull of the head. There are two kinds of bile, closed and open. The former is like that of thick oil or honey. The closed bile remains in the upper part of the body and the unclosed bile remains in both the upper and lower parts. If the open bile be in excess, the eyes become yellow, the body shakes and feels an aching sensation. If the closed bile be in excess, the human beings become mad, the mind loses its sobriety, and they do what they should not do and think what they should not think. There is phlegm in the human body. It grows in the upper part of the body and remains inside the stomach. There is puss which has no definite place of origin. It appears in all the parts of the body. It appears in boils which arise owing to the accumulation of blood in the parts of the body which are hurt or burnt. There are two kinds of blood in the human body, accumulated blood and running blood. The accumulated blood can be found in the upper part of the body and the running blood

in both the parts. The running blood passes through the veins all over the body except the fleshless portion of hair of the head, hair of the body, skin, nails and dry hard skin. The accumulated blood is below the liver. The running blood wets the heart, the kidney and the lungs. The water which comes out of the pores of the skin grows in different parts of the body. It has no definite place of origin. The fat grows in the upper and lower parts of the body. The water which comes out of the eyes remains in the eye-sockets. A kind of thin oil exists in the upper and lower parts of the body. It is found chiefly in the palms and backs of the hands, in the lower parts of the feet, in the nostrils, on forehead and shoulders, etc. Saliva remains in the upper part of the body. It remains on the tongue by the side of both the cheeks. The mucus of the brain fully occupies the nose-holes. It does not always remain in the nose-holes but when creatures cry, the elements of the body are agitated, then the rotten brain comes out through the holes of the palate and accumulates there. The synovic fluid remains in the upper and lower parts of the body. It remains in the eighty joints of the body and oils them. If it be small in quantity, a person loses his activity and feels tired. If it be large in quantity, one becomes active. The urine remains in the lower part of the body and in the bladder. Although there appears to be no entrance to the bladder, yet it enters into it and the path by which it comes out of the bladder, is wide.

Textual: The authoritative texts on which Buddhaghosa wrote commentaries belonged to the Pāli Canon, either to the *Sutta* or the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*. The texts cited or relied upon were either canonical or extra-canonical. The texts other than those recognized as authoritative by the Theras of the Mahāvihāra were bodily discarded as *bāhiraka* or extraneous. Buddhaghosa's citations indicate his intimate acquaintance with all the extant texts of the Pāli Canon.[1]

---

[1] Buddhaghosa refers to the *Itivuttaka* (*Papañcasūdanī*, II, p 106), *Udāna* (*ibid* , II, p 106), *Jātaka* (*ibid.*, II, pp 106, 314; III, pp 316, 318, IV, p. 205), *Theratherīgāthā* (*ibid* , II, p 106), *Suttanipāta* (*ibid* , II, p 106), *Buddhavamsa* (*ibid.*, IV, p 122), and *Netti* (*ibid* , I, p 31) in his *Papañcasūdanī* besides other canonical works He has also quoted passages and verses from them (*ibid* , I, pp 63, 87, 95, 112, 160, III, pp 133, 216; IV, p 170, I, pp 17, 21, 31, 120, 153, 175, II, pp 3, 16, 27, 37, III, pp 25, 65, 69, IV, pp. 6, 169; I, p 282, III, pp. 102, 137, I, p 31, IV, p 122; I, pp. 129, 131) in his own work.

In his *Sumangalavilāsinī*, Buddhaghosa has mentioned the *Itivuttaka* (Vol. I, pp. 15, 17, 23), *Udāna* (*ibid* , I, pp 15, 17, 23, 24), *Cariyāpitaka* (*ibid.*, I, pp 15, 17), *Jātaka* (*ibid* , I, pp 15, 17, 23, 24) Buddhaghosa refers to *Tittira*, *Nimi* and *Kunāla Jātakas* in his *Sumangalavilāsinī*, (I, pp 178-9, II, 676), *Theratherīgāthā* and *Buddhavamsa*, besides the *Nikāyas* and his other commentaries He quotes verses from the *Dhammapada* and *Itivuttaka* in his *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, Vol. I.

Among the extra-canonical texts he cites here and there the views of Thera Nāgasena, evidently from the *Milinda*,[1] and he mentions the *Nettipakaraṇa*.[2] When he has cited the authority of a sutta other than those included in the canon, he has expressly stated the fact to that effect.[3]

In the general introduction to his commentary on a particular canonical text, he has discussed the significance of its title besides giving an account of the number of the suttas or chapters contained in it. The five *Nikāyas* were known to him also as *Āgamas*.[4] The *Mātikās* were taken to mean the rules of conduct which were embodied in the two *Pātimokkhas*. He was aware of the fact that the Dīghabhāṇakas recognized only twelve books of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, while the Majjhimabhānakas counted them as fifteen. As regards the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*, he points out that there existed among the Buddhist teachers of old a difference of opinion as to the propriety of the inclusion of the *Kathāvatthu* in the list. Those who were reluctant to include the *Kathāvatthu* either recognized six *Abhidhamma* treatises or made up the total number of seven with the addition of the *Mahādhamma-hadaya* (now found included in the *Vibhaṅga*) or the *Mahā-dhātukathā*.[5] The contents which he gives of the seven *Abhidhamma* treatises, including the *Kathāvatthu*,[6] are, on the whole, the same as those found in the *P.T.S.* edition. He has cited the *Jātakas* in verse as well as the stories in prose, though sometimes under somewhat different titles, e.g. *Ekasiṅga Jātaka* instead of *Isisiṅga Jātaka*. It is to be regretted that even the critical editors of the Pāli canonical texts have based the texts on the manuscripts and not at all on the readings as known to Buddhaghosa and other commentators.

Doctrinal: The *Ñāṇodaya* or 'The Awakening of Knowledge' was an original *Abhidhamma* treatise written by Buddhaghosa while he was residing in South India, as a supplement to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, the first book of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*. The doctrinal exposition of Buddhism subsequently given by him in his *Visuddhimagga* and other works was entirely based upon the Theravāda tradition of the Mahāvihārà. His masterly dissertation on the subject as presented in the *Path of Purity* deals methodically with *sīla*,

In his *Sāratthappakāsinī*, Buddhaghosa mentions *Phandana* (Vol I, p 69), *Mahākapi* (Vol. I, p 345), *Mahāsāra* (Vol I, p 147), *Latukika* (Vol I, p. 70), and *Vattaka* (Vol I, p 70), *Jātakas* and *Māgandiyapañha* (Vol II, p. 258)

[1] *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p 99
[2] *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p 31.
[3] *Atthasālini*, p. 65. *svāyam attho imassa saṅgītim anārūḷhassa sutta-vasena veditabbo.*
[4] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (*P T S.*), I, p. 2.
[5] *Atthasālini*, pp. 3ff
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 6ff

samādhi and *paññā*, regarded as the three salient points of the Buddha's doctrine, the first is the means of attaining the purity of morals through conformation to the prescribed rules and laws of the mendicant's conduct, the second, the means of attaining the purity of mind and heart and developing the psychic powers through meditation and mental concentration, and the third, the means of attaining the purity of knowledge and thought through the proper understanding of the import of the basic ideas of Buddhist thought and path. The scholastic exposition is enlivened throughout with apt citations from the canonical texts which were recognized by him as the principal authority. His *Path of Purity* may be rightly regarded as an *epitome* of all his writings. But there are many other points of interest and importance which he has dealt with in his other writings, e.g. his dissertation on the subject of the Buddhist Refuges (*Saraṇas*),[1] the Precepts (*Sikkhāpadas*),[2] the Concepts (*Paññattis*),[3] the Door Theory of Cognition (*Dvārakathā*),[4] to mention only the most notable ones.

The illustrations drawn from life and nature have made the discussions lively and illuminating. But in many places he is found to be in the rôle of an etymologist, and there his arguments are tedious and unconvincing. It seems that he is out to defend everything, mythical or legendary, if it is contained in any of the canonical texts. It cannot be said that he was quite fair to the opponents and outsiders. He is generally brilliant in his expositions of the psycho-ethical concepts of *Theravāda*. It was Nāgārjuna who pointed out that the Buddha presented his doctrine from the two standpoints of *sammuti* and *paramattha*. Buddhaghosa has followed this lead without acknowledgment. He has discussed the Sarvāstivāda distinction between the *paṭisaṃkhā nirodha* and the *appaṭisaṃkhā nirodha* without showing the least tendency to appreciate their significance. Similarly his treatment of the philosophical views of the leading thinkers of the Buddha's time is utterly lacking in appreciation. His main tendency is often to expose their hollowness. There is hardly any evidence of his being a metaphysician with sound logical training. His strong point is the psychological foundation of Buddhist ethics, and here his contributions must always be assessed at a high value. One can say that the final development of the Theravāda philosophy and Buddhism was reached in his writings and all that we get after him are nothing but later digests of his disquisitions.

[1] *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, pp 229ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, p. 181.
[3] *Puggalapaññatti-Aṭṭhakathā*, *P.T.S.*, p. 171.
[4] *Atthasālinī*, pp 102ff.

CHAPTER VII

PHILOSOPHY

Buddhaghosa's philosophy presents the tenets of Theravāda in their final scholastic development. We cannot talk of his own philosophy if it cannot be distinguished from the views and ideas which were developed before him in the Sinhalese commentaries on which he based his writings and expositions. We can call it his philosophy at least in the sense that whatever was before him he made his own. There is even a deeper reason for that assumption. Whatever might be his mental feeling in presenting the pure doctrine of Theravāda, the fact is that while presenting it he unconsciously did so from his personal standpoint. Behind this standpoint we find a mental make up and an angle of vision which are his own characteristics. The historical position of Buddhaghosa in relation to Theravāda is such that Buddhaghosa means Theravāda and Theravāda means Buddhaghosa. It will, therefore, be worth our while to ascertain, as far as practicable, what shape Theravāda finally took in his hands and what was the personal element behind his presentation of the same.

Although, according to tradition, Buddhaghosa was previously an adherent of the system of Patañjali, he is strong, throughout his works, in his attacks on *Pakativāda*, that is, the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga systems which believe in the dual principles of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. He always differentiates the Buddhist conception of *Avijjā* from the *Prakṛtivādin's* conception of *Prakṛti* as the root cause of things [1] and the Buddhist conception of *Nāmarūpa* from the common idea of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. The vital element in the Buddhist chain of causation is the conception that ignorance of truth in the individual—not a cosmic force—produces in the substitute for a self-impression, which until counteracted by knowledge results in producing ignorance in a future birth and so on *ad infinitum*, and in the Sāṅkhya and Yoga, we have the same idea of ignorance—here of the non-connection of spirit and matter-producing impressions; both systems likewise recognize the importance of the factor of desire.[2]

Buddhaghosa betrays, nevertheless, his previous predilection for the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga systems. He uses

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, Vol II, p. 525.

[2] Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 141.

the very simile of the blind and the lame by which the concepts of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are illustrated.[1] Indeed, taking into consideration all available evidence we cannot but agree with M. Oltramare in maintaining that the Buddhist conception of Nāmarūpa was from a certain date steadily tending towards the Sāṅkhya conception of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. We can trace in Buddhaghosa's writings a chracteristic trend of Buddhist thought which colours his philosophical outlook. His *Abhidhamma* treatise, '*Ñāṇodaya*' or the 'Awakening of Knowledge' was alike a product of this Buddhist influence. But we must remember, as Mrs. Rhys Davids[2] shows, that the time when he came, 'the philosophical culture of Buddhist India was expressing itself in Sanskrit. In the literature of that culture there is ample testimony, in such works as survive, to reveal developments in logic and in metaphysics'. For centuries past India produced generations of subtle thinkers and rational philosophers and in this background Buddhist thinkers had to plough with the seeds of their patience and diligence. Pischel aptly observes, 'The more we advance in Central Asiatic research, the clearer it appears that, for a great portion of the Orient, Buddhism was not less a vehicle of culture than Christianity has been for the Occident. While Buddhism as a religion, gains (by that research) ever in value, as a philosophy it sinks ever deeper.'[3] The whole of Buddhist philosophy along with Buddhist religion, therefore, rests on a psychological basis.[4] It is in this psychological treatment that we may find the remarkable excellence of Buddhaghosa. He expounds his psychology in terms of the five aggregates, these being material qualities, feeling, sense-perception, complexes of consciousness or coefficients and consciousness itself.[5]

Avijjā: The term *Avijjā* is generally rendered as ignorance, which does not, however, bring out the philosophical connotation of the term. As regards *avijjā*, Buddhaghosa has raised a very interesting point. Can it be treated as an uncaused root-principle like the *mūla-prakṛti* of the Sāṅkhya philosophy? With the Buddhists *avijjā* is not uncaused. Buddhaghosa, however, admits that there are some texts in which *avijjā* may appear to be similar to the *mūla-prakṛti* of the Sāṅkhya system. He thus refers to a passage in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* in which the Buddha is represented as

---

[1] Cf. the passage quoted in Vyāsa's commentary on *Yoga Sūtra*, III, 44.
[2] *Buddhism*, p 44
[3] Mrs Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, pp 30-31.
[4] Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Psychology* (Quest Series), p. 6.
[5] *Ibid*, p. 40

saying: 'The beginning of *avijjā* does not appear so that one might say that ignorance did not exist formerly but it has since come into being. However, it is apparent that *avijjā* is conditioned.' With the exponents of Buddhism *avijjā* is not conceived on the lines of the Sāṅkhya *Prakṛti*. This is evident from the Anamata Saṃyutta in which the Buddha is represented as saying: 'Incalculable (endless) is the process of *saṃsāra*, the beginning of beings running through the course of *saṃsāra* being cloaked by *avijjā* and tied to *bhavataṇhā* does not appear.'[1] In the chain of causation *avijjā* is the main link, the *prima causa*, so to say, of the cosmic process of birth and death. A text of the *Suttanipāta*[2] gives the links of the chain of causation which are as follows: Action which, based on ignorance, leads man to constant rebirth; ignorance, confections (*sankhāra*), allied to perception (*saññā*), consciousness, contact, feeling, thirst, which leads to grasping (*upādāna*), grasping which leads to becoming (*bhava*), rebirth, death and misery, efforts, ailments (*āhāra*), and movements. The reverse order also applies; the destruction of ignorance serves to set about a chain of destruction as effective as the creation. This is the formula of dependent production (*paṭicca-samuppāda*), a term which moves scholasticism to ask whether the effect goes towards the cause, or the cause to the effect. 'Ignorance in the chain has,' says Keith, 'it is certain, a purely limited sense, and no cosmic significance, similar to that of ignorance in the Vedānta, through which the absolute passes into the empirical. It is repeatedly defined, and is always the individual's ignorance of the four noble truths, or an equivalent: the origin and disappearance of the aggregates making up individuality, or the delusion which recognizes a self. Ignorance is traced in the canon[3] to diverse causes, . . . More briefly, it is desire or thirst which produces ignorance, and thirst in turn arises because the feelings which evoke it are permeated by ignorance. Thus we have as long as the one lasts the other; there can be no question of finding a beginning for ignorance, just as in the Sāṅkhya the failure to discriminate between soul and nature leaves an impression on the internal organs which produces in the next birth the same fatal ignorance.'[4] The Buddha thus sought to account for the cosmic process of the cycle of births and deaths by mentioning two specific conditions of actions, namely, ignorance and desire for existence.[5]

---

[1] *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, II, p 186
[2] *P.T.S.*, pp. 140 foll ; cf. *J R.A S*, 1916, pp. 709ff.
[3] *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, V, 113f. [4] *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 99.
[5] B. C. Law, *Concepts of Buddhism*, p. 50.

According to Buddhaghosa, *avijjā* involves obtaining of that which is not to be obtained, e.g. bodily sin and so on. It is thus at the root of our existence in this world, the condition precedent to all the evils like death, old age and so on. It is the *raison d'être*, so to say, of all *saṅkhāras* in sensual life and is at the back of *arūpasaṅkhāras* or formless existence.[1] It has been described as one of the *āsavas*, *oghas*, *yogas*, etc.[2] In the light of *Abhidhamma* it may be interpreted as absence of knowledge of the four truths or of the eight matters which it lays down. In the Nidāna Saṃyutta of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*[3] the Blessed One is represented as explaining to the bhikkhus the chain of causation which begins with ignorance (*avijjā*) and ends with birth, old age and death leading to grief, lamentation, suffering, sorrow, and despair. In the chain of causation, we find that the six senses originate from name and form (*Nāma-rūpa*).[4]

Saṅkhāra: From this recognition the works of ideation and understanding proceed so that the mind sets itself to a process of synthesis. This synthesizing factor of mind is called *Saṅkhāra*. *Saṅkhāra*, like the Sanskrit *Saṃskāra*, is a term of varying, but consistent and intelligible, meaning; it denotes the making ready or complete something for an end—an idea emphasized in the compound *Abhisaṃkhāra*, and also the result of the activity when achieved. Hence it has no exclusive application to the psychical sphere; the movement given to a potter's wheel is styled as *Abhisaṃkhāra*;[5] the wheel rolls on so long as the impression thus communicated lasts. Hence *Saṅkhāras* may be divided, as often, between those of the body, speech, or thought; expiration and inspiration are *Saṅkhāras*;[6] when the Buddha decides to enter *Nirvāṇa* he lets go his *Āyusaṅkhāra*,[7] his disposition to live, the motive force which but for his decision would have continued to keep alive his mortal frame; it is inconceivable that nothing more is meant than that the Buddha laid aside merely a subjective process. The same point arises regarding the *Saṅkhāras* which affect the form of rebirth of the dead; a monk who forms a resolve to be reborn in a noble family achieves this result from the *Saṅkhāra* thus framed;[8] here

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, pp. 522ff

[2] Childers, *Pāli Dictionary*, p. 73.

[3] Pt. II, pp. 1–33.

[4] B C Law, *Concepts of Buddhism*, p. 52.

[5] *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, 1, 112.

[6] *Majjhima Nikāya*, P.T S., 1, 301; *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, P.T.S , IV, 293, *Vibh* , 135.

[7] *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, 106; cf. *Majjhima Nikāya*, P.T.S., 1, 295f.; *Jātaka*, ed. Fausboll, IV, 215.

[8] *Majjhima Nikāya*, P.T.S., III, 100; *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, p. 310.

again we cannot believe that the rebirth is a pure figment of the creative imagination, just as little as it is credible that a man who has the disposition to pay a visit (*gamikābhisaṅkhāro*) has merely the idea of himself as on a journey.[1] Such a conception is clearly far from the texts, which frankly tell us that a man forms the *Saṅkhāra* of the body when a body exists, and it is incredible that the body, which is described as the ancient deed made ready (*abhisaṅkhataṃ*) and made real by mental activity (*abhisaṃcetayitam*), is really to be understood as merely the ancient act conceived or presented to consciousness as existing.[2] .... the *Saṅkhāras* are one of the five *khandhas* which constitute the individual of Buddhism; they appear side by side with the material form (*rūpa*) or body, feeling (*vedanā*), perception (*saññā*) and intellect or consciousness (*viññāṇa*), and there is clearly no room here for the concept of ideas; rather they are the dispositions which lead to rebirth, precisely parallel to the *Saṃskāras*, which in the Sāṅkhya system represent the predispositions of the individual resulting from the impressions left by former thoughts and deeds. In the chain of causation the Saṅkhāras play the same rôle; they are not the creation of ignorance of the illusory character of the world, something much simpler is meant by reason of his ignorance of the doctrine of misery as taught by the Buddha.[3] There is a similar error in interpreting idealistically the signification of *Sankhāra* when used as a synonym of Dhamma, of things in general. Keith observes that the *Saṅkhāras* should not be regarded as things in relation to mind (*Saṃkhata*); rather the term has the more general signification of product, as well as of producing, and it is therefore naturally and directly applied to the whole world of external reality as well as to mental products.[4] The *saḷāyatana* includes the six organs and objects of sense, of which *Saṅkhāra* is one like *rūpa*, *vedanā*, *saññā*, and *viññāṇa*. The term '*Saṅkhāra*' has also been rendered as 'complexes' or 'mental coefficients'. The latest rendering of the word is 'synergies' by Mrs. Rhys Davids.[5] Buddhaghosa treats it as one of the five *khandhas* or constituent elements. *Saṅkhāras* or confections of mind have the characteristic of composing, the function of combining and the manifestation of being busy. They are of three kinds as moral, immoral and indeterminate. Of these, moral consciousness of the realm of sense

---

[1] *Mahāvagga* ed. Oldenberg, *Vinaya Piṭaka*, I, VI, 31, 2.

[2] *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, P T.S., II, 64f.

[3] *Buddhist Philosophy*, pp. 50-51.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 74

[5] *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, second ed. XI; *Path of Purity*, Pt. III, Chap. XIV, p. 540 f.n.

is of thirty-six kinds, of which twenty-seven are constant and five inconstant and the remaining four of a different nature. The *Visuddhimagga*[1] gives a detailed list of these states. Among the immoral type of *saṅkhāras*, there are seventeen mental activities in the consciousness rooted in greed, of which thirteen are constant. Of the immoral consciousness rooted in hatred, there are eighteen mental activities, of which eleven are of the nature of constant and three inconstant. Of the immoral consciousness arising from delusion there are thirteen mental activities associated with a state of perplexity. Of the indeterminate, the resultant indeterminate mental activities are of two kinds as conditioned and unconditioned. Conditioned and unconditioned mental activities may again be sub-divided according to the association of the resultant consciousness with eye, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind.[2] The *Visuddhimagga* (Chap. XIV) states that *Saṅkhārakkhandha* includes fifty-one *saṅkhāras* like *phassa*, *cetanā*, *vitakka*, *vicāra*, *pīti*, *samādhi*, *saddhā*, *lobha*, *moha*, *māna*, *dosa*, *issā* and so on. The vital point about a '*Saṅkhāra*' is that it is 'cetasika', being the work of mind. S. N. Das Gupta[3] aptly says: 'It is called *Saṅkhāra* because it synthesises the conglomerated (*Saṅkhataṃ abhisaṅkharonti*). It is thus a synthetic function which synthesises the passive *rūpa*, *saññā*, *saṅkhāra* and *viññāna* elements.' The term '*abhisaṅkhāra*' is also used as a synonym of '*saṅkhāra*'. The latter is also interpreted as *karma*, matter, and so on. *Saṅkhārakkhandha* and *Paṭiccasamuppāda* have many points in common. Both of them relate to mind; the *saṅkhāras* of *Paṭiccasamuppāda* are said to be good and bad *cetanās*, while those of the *khandha* are said to be mental conditions. According to Childers[4], in some cases, sentient beings are included under the term *saṅkhāra*, in others the terms *satta* and *saṅkhāra* are distinctly opposed. The fourth *khandha* known as *saṅkhārakkhandha* has a somewhat different meaning. Here the aggregations are certain properties and faculties of the sentient being, fifty-two in number. S. Z. Aung[5] opines that *Saṅkhārakkhandha* means 'the group of volitions and other associated factors'. *Saṅkhāra* is thus synonymous with *karma* and is chiefly applied to *cetanā*. It also denotes the properties concomitant with the *cetanā*. Kern[6] remarks that

---

[1] Vol II, Chap XIV

[2] *Visuddhimagga*, pp 462ff.

[3] *A History of Indian Philosophy*, p 96

[4] *Pāli Dictionary*, pp 453 and 455.

[5] *Compendium of Philosophy*, 274.

[6] *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 52.

Saṅkhāras are affections, temporary mental or moral dispositions, having their motive in *vedanā*.

Viññāṇa: The state of consciousness is involved in all process of *vedanā* or feeling for it is the conscious mind that feels and works at the bottom of all kinds of experience. *Viññāṇa* is consciousness which, according to the Buddha, runs on and continues without break of identity.[1] As such *viññāṇa* may be regarded as one of the *khandhas* or constituent elements. *Viññāṇa* is cognising. *Viññāṇakhandha* is consciousness as an aggregate. In the expression '*manoviññāṇadhātu*' a single (moment of) consciousness is called by three names: *mano* (mind) in the sense of measuring; *viññāṇa* (consciousness) in the sense of discrimination, and *dhātu* (element) in the philosophical sense of ultimate reality or of absence of a living entity.[2] The difference between mere perception and consciousness or *viññāṇam* should thus be understood according to Buddhaghosa. Thus although perception, consciousness or cognition and understanding are the same as regards knowing, perception is the mere noting of objects such as blue, green, yellow; it cannot reach the penetration into characteristics as impermanent, ill, selfless and so on. Consciousness knows objects to be blue, green, yellow and reaches the penetration into characteristics.[3] Keith says that intellect (*viññāṇa*) is undoubtedly the chief term which comprehensively covers mental phenomena in the canon, as might be expected from the earlier Brahmanical tendency to use the word in this generic way. It represents such unity as there is in the self of experience. Synonymous with viññāna, according to Buddhaghosa, are Citta and Manas, but there are obvious preferences in use; Viññāṇa often occurs in special connection with sense cognition; Manas again is, in accordance with Brahmanical usage, pre-eminently the intellectual function of consciousness, and Citta the introspective aspect of self-examination, but these are only nuances.[4] *Viññāna* is practically wide enough to include both perception and feeling since it is credited with appreciation of feeling as well as perceptive power. This is admitted in a dialogue in the Majjhima Nikaya (1, 292f.).[5] According to Buddhaghosa, consciousness, thought and mind are the same in meaning (*Cittaṃ iti pi mano iti pi viññāṇam*).[6] Consciousness with its characteristic of being conscious is one in intrinsic nature. It is threefold in kind; moral (*kusala*),

---

[1] *Mahātanhāsaṅkhaya Sutta, M.N.*, I, pp. 256ff ; *Concepts of Buddhism*, 52.
[2] *Atthasālini*, pp 140ff.
[3] *Visuddhimagga*, p. 437.
[4] Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 85.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 87.
[6] *Samyutta*, II, p. 95.

immoral (*akusala*) and indeterminate (*avyākata*). Of these, the moral is fourfold by way of plane: the realm of sense (*kāmāvacarakusala*), the realm of form (*rūpāvacarakusala*), the realm of the formless (*arūpāvacarakusala*), and the transcendental (*lokuttara*). Of these the realm of sense is of eight kinds owing to the divisions into joy and equanimity, understanding and external prompting (instigation). The realm of form is of five kinds as being conjoined with *jhāna* factors, to wit: the first conjoined with inception of thought, sustained thinking, zest, ease and concentration; the second with excessive applied thinking; then the third with excessive sustained thinking; then the fourth with detached zest and the fifth conjoined with equanimity and concentration. The realm of the formless is of four kinds: the first is conjoined with *jhāna* of the infinitude of space; the second, third and fourth with the infinitude of consciousness and so on. The transcendental is of four kinds as being conjoined with the four Paths (*maggas*). Thus moral consciousness is of twenty-one kinds. The immoral is single in plane, viz. of the realm of sense. It is of three kinds according to its origin from greed (*lobha*), hatred (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*). Of these, that which has its root in greed is of eight kinds owing to the divisions of joy and equanimity, wrong views, and external promptings. That which has its root in hatred is twofold as accompanied with grief, associated with hatred and external promptings. That which has its root in delusion is twofold as accompanied by equanimity, associated with doubt and flurry. It should be understood as proceeding in times of indecision and wavering. Thus the immoral consciousness is of twelve kinds. The indeterminate (*avyākata*) is twofold in kind: resultant (*vipāka*) and inoperative (*kiriyā*). In the four planes the resultant consciousness is of thirty-six kinds. The inoperative consciousness as to the division into plane is of three kinds: of the realm of sense, of the realm of form, and of the realm of the formless. In the three planes the entire inoperative consciousness is of twenty kinds. Thus there are eighty-nine classes of consciousness in all, namely, moral twenty-one; immoral, twelve; resultant, thirty-six; inoperative, twenty.[1] *Lokuttara* or transcendental is divided into four according to four *maggas* and it is again divided into four according to four *phalas*. According to Childers, *Viññāṇa* means intelligence, knowledge, consciousness, thought and mind. He observes in this connection: '*Viññāṇa* as the thinking part of the individual is the most important of the

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, pp. 452ff.

five *khandhas*, and if any one *khandha* can be said to constitute the individual it is this. In Buddha's words, by the destruction of Mind, the whole being perishes.' [1] The intelligence (*viññāṇa*) is, therefore, compared with the guardian of a city, who, seated at the cross roads, watches the coming of men from diverse directions.[2] Broadly speaking consciousness is of six kinds according as it is of eye, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind. According to Ledi Sadaw [3] *Viññāṇa* or consciousness is the specific awareness of the material quality (*rūpa*) called heat. There is also through that material quality, a touching, an impressing, a colliding with the sensitive skin (*kāya*). 'Consciousness', according to Aung,[4] 'may be tentatively defined as the relation between *ārammaṇika* and *ārammaṇa*'. He points out that the object of consciousness is either object of sense or object of thought. The former falls naturally into five classes while the latter has the same number of subdivisions of which *citta* is one. Keith draws a distinction between the originating or receptacle intelligence (*ālayavijñāna*) and the individual intellectual experiences of the process (*pravṛttivijñāna*). On the strictly orthodox view the receptacle thought may be held to be nothing but a collective expression for the whole series of particular thoughts, or to put it in another light the receptacle intelligence at any moment consists of the actual particular intellectual action together with all the potencies latent in it, for the intellectual moment is charged with impressions of the whole of the experience of the apparent individual from time immemorial. It appears thus that the receptacle intellect does not denote any special concrete reality; it has no origination, duration or destruction. From another point of view we may hold that the flux of intellectual moments does not actually infect the receptacle intelligence but is comparable to an image reflected in a mirror which remains untouched by it, or to a sound echoed by the rocks which suffer themselves no change. Thus the receptacle intelligence would be akin to the person (*puruṣa*) of the Sāṅkhya.[5]

Citta: All forms are thus registered and cognised through the sensory-mental process. Hence Buddhaghosa defines '*citta*' as that which cognises external objects. In his *Atthasālinī* (pp. 63 foll.), Buddhaghosa describes the characteristics of *citta*. By consciousness (*citta*) is meant that

---

1 Childers, *Pali Dictionary*, pp. 576-77.
2 *Milinda-Pañho*, p 62, *Buddhist Philosophy* (A B. Keith), pp 82-83.
3 *Some points in Buddhist Doctrine*, p 148.
4 *Compendium of Philosophy*, pp. 2-3
5 *Buddhist Philosophy*, pp. 245-6.

which thinks of its object, is aware variously. Inasmuch as this word 'consciousness' is common to all states or classes of consciousness, that which is known as moral, immoral or the great inoperative is termed 'consciousness'. It is called '*citta*' because it arranges itself in a series (*cinoti*) by way of apperception in a process of thought. The resultant is also termed 'consciousness' because it is accumulated (*cito*) by action (*kamma*). These four mental states are termed 'consciousness' or '*citta*' for they are variegated (*citra*) according to circumstances. The meaning of consciousness may also be understood from its capacity of producing a variety or diversity of its effects. Moreover consciousness with lust is one thing, that with hatred is another, that with delusion is another, that experienced in the universe of sense is another, and those experienced in the universe of attenuated matter, etc., are others. Different is consciousness with a visible object, with an auditory object, etc.; and in that with visible objects, varied is consciousness of a blue-green object, of a yellow object, etc. The same is the case with consciousness of auditory objects. And of all this consciousness one class is low, another is medium and a third is exalted. Among the low class again consciousness is different when dominated by desire-to-do or when dominated by energy or by investigation. Therefore the variegated nature of consciousness should be understood by way of these characteristics of association, locality, object, the three degrees of comparison and dominance.[1] Its characteristic is recognition. Without its agency there can be no sense perception. The *Atthasālinī*,[2] therefore, lays down, whatever one sees through his eyes, hears through his ears, smells through his nose, tastes through his tongue, touches through his body and cognises through his mind—all these he recognises by his *citta*. *Yaṃ cakkhunā rūpaṃ passati . . . yaṃ sotena saddaṃ suṇāti, ghānena gandhaṃ ghāyati, jivhāya rasaṃ sāyati, kāyena phoṭṭhabbaṃ phusati, manasā dhammaṃ vijānāti tam viññāṇena vijānātīti.* The inoperative mind-element is connected with emptiness, in which state no living entity exists. The sense-organs merely transmit the image or impression of external objects, the mind receives the wave and recognises the objects, scrutinises and discerns them. In the absence of mind there is no visual or other cognition (*manodhātuniddesa*).[3] Mrs. Rhys Davids[4] describes *citta* and *cetasika* as 'the shell and the contents of a sphere'. The term *citta* is explained by her as consciousness

---

[1] *Atthasālinī* (P.T.S.), p. 64.
[2] P.T.S., p. 112.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 263.
[4] *Buddhist Psychology*, p. 8.

(mind, 'heart', intelligence).[1] In this connection she draws our attention to a significant passage from the commentary of Buddhaghosa: '*cittam iti pi mano iti pi viññāṇam*' where Buddhaghosa calls all three a name for the *manāyatana* or sphere of cognition.[2] In the *Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā* written by Buddhaghosa,[3] the term '*citta*' and '*cetasika*' are used to denote the same thing (i.e. mind). *Cetasikā* (literally meaning from *citta* or mind) or mental is described as that which depends on mind (*cittanissitako*) and '*phassikā*' or 'contactual' is explained in the same way as '*phassanissitako*'.

According to Spence Hardy,[4] the action of the mind upon the power of reflection produces thought. Mind is thus the main instrument connected with *cetanā*. So *citta* is described in a nutshell in the following way: '*ārammaṇaṃ cintetīti cittam*'. S. Z. Aung [5] points out that the word *cinteti* is here used in its most comprehensive sense of *vijānāti* (to know). The mind is, therefore, ordinarily defined as that which is conscious of an object. Such a definition may be called the *Kattusādhana* way of defining things by which an agency is attributed to the thing denoted by the term. *Citta* and *viññāṇa* are thus identical. The latter indicates the idea of totality of consciousness. Mind is thus a source of consciousness or in the words of Ledi Sadaw, 'representative consciousness'. *Cittam* (thought) is the element of mind-consciousness.[6] Thought and mind are given as meanings of the term *viññāṇa*.[7] Keith says, 'Intelligence appears under diverse aspects; as *citta* it accumulates action, as mind it synthesises, as Vijñāna it forms judgements, as sense it has consciousness of objects'.[8] Mind is the co-ordinating intellectual activity, but the conception of the relation of sensation and mind is by no means clear of confusion. In its capacity as will the mind appears as *citta*. Every act, feeling, or thought is accompanied by a latent state, which later comes to fruition, and thus bridges the gulf between the cause and the effect in the working of the principle of action. In the case of verbal or bodily action the impress is quasimaterial (*avijñapti*).[9] The concept of *citta* with all its subtleties will ever remain an unintelligible mystery to an untrained

[1] *Buddhist Psychology*, p 6 [2] *Ibid*, pp 17-18.
[3] B C Law, *The Debates Commentary* (P.T S), pp 117-18, *J P T S*, 1889, p 95
[4] *Manual of Buddhism*, pp. 420-421
[5] *Compendium of Philosophy*, p. 2
[6] *Visuddhimagga* (P.T.S), p. 486.
[7] Childers, *Pali Dictionary*, p. 576.
[8] *Buddhist Philosophy*, p 246. [9] *Ibid*, p. 199.

superficial thinker. Ledi Sadaw[1] rightly remarks: 'They consider their own mind as a permanent something. They conceive the self-same mind moving about here and there within the body. The self-same mind in the morning, the self-same mind at noon, and at eventide the self-same mind . . . what they neither know nor see is conditioned genesis of mind (*citto*)'.

Nāmarūpa: 'Name' refers to the three aggregates beginning with feeling (namely feeling, perception and mental activities) because they bend (*namanti*) towards the object. The term 'mind' (*nāma*) is applied to mental properties, because 'names' once given to them are fixed, because they bend objects or as objects they bend the mind unto themselves. 'Matter' is that which changes its state or condition due to four causes, heat or cold and the rest.[2] The concept of name and form arises from the dual idea of mind and matter. *Rūpa* (*lit.* shape, form) is so called because it reveals itself. But *nāma* being subtle has to depend on a 'name' to make itself known; hence making a 'name'.[3] Name is fourfold: (1) name given on a special occasion, (2) name given by virtue of a personal quality, (3) name given by acclamation, and (4) names which arise of themselves or spontaneously.[4] Thus it has been said that the name of king Mahāsammata is a name chosen by the people and given on a special occasion. Similarly on the name-giving day of a male child, the relatives stand round and having done honour to those worthy of gifts, agree to give the name, saying, 'His name is so-and-so'. This is an instance of name given by acclamation, for parents by acclamation make a name for their son: 'Let him be called Tissa, Phussa', etc. The name also takes its birth from a special virtue or quality of the person or thing named. Thus we call a person preacher. Thus too we speak of a Three-piṭaka-man, a Vinaya-student, a Faithful individual or a Believer. In these cases the names are given by virtue of a personal quality. The various hundred names of the *Tathāgata*, such as the Blessed, the Arahant, the Supremely Enlightened, etc., are also such names. Lastly, perception, feeling and other elements of consciousness, the great earth, the sun, the moon, the stars and so on make their own name as they arise. When they arise their name also arises. For no one, when feeling arises, says: 'Be thou called feeling' as when the earth appears there

[1] *Some Points in Buddhist Doctrine*, *J P T.S.* (1913-14), p. 155

[2] *Atthasālinī* (P T S.), p. 52.

[3] *Expositor*, II, p 500 f n. 4.

[4] *Atthasālinī* (P.T S.), p. 390

is no function of name-taking: 'Be thou called earth.' So when it arises the name 'feeling' just arises, answering to the spontaneously arising concept. The same is true for perception and the rest of mind. For feeling, whether it be in the past, present or future is after all and always just feeling. And so is perception, so are mental activities, so is consciousness. But Nibbāna is always Nibbāna. Such is name in the sense of name-making. The four aggregates are 'name' in the sense of bending, for they bend towards the object of thought. In the sense of causing to bend, all are 'name' for the four aggregates cause one another to bend on to the object.[1]

The compound Nāma-rūpa serves to denote spirit and matter, specialised normally to denote the concrete individual, in which both are united, while the old term self (attā) *constantly occurs in those phrases which are the source of its* reflexive use in grammar.[2] Name and form, it is claimed, denote the phenomenal being in its entirety, as possessed of qualitative discriminations which are appreciated by consciousness through resistance contact and of different descriptions which are gathered by designative contact. The converse doctrine, also canonical, that consciousness depends on name and form is explained as the other side of the relation; the empirical consciousness is impossible save in relation to an object.[3] The form is matter, the name is the other four aggregates, feeling, perception or ideation, dispositions and consciousness itself.[4] Professor Jacobi and Pischel think that the concept of name and form is similar to the idea of individuation of the Sāṅkhya. But according to Keith such a parallelism is untenable.[5]

By 'form' are understood the four primaries (e.g. the earth-element, the water-element, fire-element and air-element) and matter derived therefrom (which are twenty-four in number, e.g. eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, visible object, sound, odour, taste, integration of matter, continuity of matter, decay of matter, transitoriness of matter and so on). Whatever state has the characteristic of changing through cold, heat, hunger, thirst and so forth, all such states taken together are to be known as the aggregate of matter (rūpam).[6] Thus the aggregate of matter is 'form'; the four non-material aggregates (e.g. feeling, perception, mental activities and consciousness or understanding) which

[1] *Atthasālinī* (P.T S), p. 392.
[2] Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 85.
[3] *Ibid*, p 54.
[4] *Ibid*, p. 101.
[5] *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 141.
[6] *Visuddhimagga* (P.T.S.), p 443.

are in a sense the states of the formless registering the states of the form constitute 'name' (*nāma*). Whatever form there is, all such may be explained in terms of the four great primaries and others derived from them. And so the explanation of name lies in the sense-organ of mind and the associated mental processes resulting therefrom. And this name and this form give rise to (the dual idea) name-and-form (Nāmarūpa).[1] The couple name and form depend on each other and when one breaks up, so through relation does the other. On account of the drum sound arises; on account of form name arises. Just as the drum is void of the sound and the sound is void of the drum, so name is void of form and form is void of name. Nevertheless, depending on name, form proceeds and depending on form, name proceeds. Of the two, either is without power and is unable to proceed by its own effort. Separately they are unable to perform their various functions.[2] There is no being or person or *deva,* or *Brahmā* higher than the mere name-and-form.[3] Ledi Sadaw[4] elucidates in a simple way the Buddhist conception of Nāmarūpa. Name has a twofold aspect, namely, (1) name as determined by convention or usage, and (2) name in its ultimate meaning. In saying 'person' we give a name not to the aggregates (of a living organism) but to our idea corresponding to the form or appearance presented by those aggregates. And this idea or concept of an appearance does not exist objectively (independently of mind). Hence in this 'name' neither the meaning nor the name itself has any real existence. Yet the great majority perceive and imagine, when they recognise the name that there actually is what is named self or soul or entity or person. And for this reason we term name 'conventional' when it is merely determined as a designation by popular usage. But when not resting upon mere customary usage, people consider those ultimates, the aggregates, as self, soul, entity, person, then they exceed the scope of customary usage. In name, under its ultimate aspect we are considering ultimate phenomena which are entirely without external appearance, and which are only modes and changes and phases of process. There is no 'life' (or 'living soul', *jīvo*) apart from what we call the two powers or faculties of material and psychical life (*dve nāma rūpajīvitindriyāni*). Now a 'living soul' is generally perceived and ordinarily reckoned as 'some one living a week, a month, a

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, p 590.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp 595-596 [3] *Ibid.*, p 593
[4] *Some Points in Buddhist Doctrine, J.P.T S* (1913-14), pp. 124–129.

year', etc.; the essence of the living appearance is commonly considered to be the self; the essence of its continuity is considered to be the 'living soul'. But the two powers or faculties of life are but the vital (coefficients) of momentary phenomena only, not of a personal entity.

Āyatana: The word '*āyatana*' has been rendered as 'sphere' by Mrs. Rhys Davids.[1] Some translate it as organ of sense and object of sense.[2] According to the *Visuddhimagga*[3] the *āyatanas* are twelve in number, the six senses having six different qualities for enjoyment, namely, *cakkhu, rūpa, sota, sadda, ghāna, gandha, jivhā, rasa, kāya, phoṭṭabba, mana* and *dhamma*. The five sense organs (e.g. eye, ear, nose, tongue and body) along with the mind make up the *saḷāyatanas*. The twelve bases of mental action (*āyatanas*) are the five senses, the five sense objects, the mind and ideas, these being the necessary materials for the functioning of consciousness.[4] The eighteen factors (*dhātus*) of consciousness consist of the twelve bases together with the six forms of consciousness, the five senses and mind.[5] *Phassa* is due to these six sense-organs and objects of sense or *āyatanas*. Buddhaghosa says[6] that the sense-organs are due to *kamma* and it is *kamma* which differentiates them.

Phassa: The presence of an external object gives the stimulus for our sensory-motor activities and all the mental processes involved in it come as a matter of course. Contact produces feeling, causes it to arise. Just as it is the heat in heated lac, and not the coals, or external cause, which produces softness, so albeit there is another cause, viz., the mental object and the basis, it is the consciousness in which feeling inheres which produces it. Because contact arises by means of suitable attention or adverting and through some faculty (i.e. eye, etc.) immediately in the object that has been prepared by consciousness, therefore contact has as its proximate cause an object that has entered the avenue of thought.[7] In the absence then of any contact or association of the above kind with a generating object, there can be no physical or psychic activity. This contact or '*phassa*' is thus a condition precedent to all action. This sense-impact or *phassa* is the root cause of all sensation.[8] *Phassa* has thus the

[1] *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics*, p. 27

[2] Childers, *Pali Dictionary*, p 75

[3] Vol II, p. 481

[4] *Tarkarahasyadīpikā* of Guṇaratna, Ed B.I., pp 31 foll, *Abhidhammatthasangaha*, P T S, VII, 8, *Compendium of Philosophy*, pp. 254 foll

[5] Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p 202

[6] *Visuddhimagga*, pp 444-5

[7] *Atthasālinī* (P.T S), p 109.

[8] B. C Law, *Concepts of Buddhism*, p. 45.

characteristic of touching. Its function is to bring one in contact with an external object, its effect is to bring together. In itself it is void and formless. It exists by sticking to some object. The relation between *phassa* and its object is the relation between eye and form, ear and sound, mind and object of thought.[1] The *Atthasālinī*[2] states that three kinds of classification are obtained in the exposition of the word contact. *Phassaphusanā* (touch, touching) is a classification according to the letter; *samphusana* (the touching to unite with) is according to the prefix; *samphusitatta* (the state of touching to unite with) is according to the meaning. Contact has the function of touching, feeling of enjoying, perception of noting, volition of co-ordinating and consciousness of cognising.[3] *Phassa* is therefore described as one of the *Saṅkhāras*. The six senses (i.e. the usual five sense organs together with mind) give rise to six kinds of *phassa*, namely, (1) *cakkhusamphassa*, (2) *sotasamphassa*, (3) *ghānasamphassa*, (4) *jivhāsamphassa*, (5) *kāyasamphassa*, and (6) *manosamphassa*. According to Keith the first five sense organs, e.g., eye, ear, smell, taste, touch, are material but invisible. They function by resistance contact (*paṭigha*); the same term (*āyatana*) is used for the objects as spheres or fields of sense in another aspect of the word; these objects are material and external. The mind is immaterial, invisible, not affected by resistance contact; it is composed of a mind element of obscure character and has a physical basis of some sort; its objects are both exterior objects mediated by the other senses and ideas. The mind element seems indistinguishable from consciousness element, mind being essentially consciousness.[4] Conditioned by sixfold sense, contact comes to pass, the six contacts resulting therefrom being of eye, of ear, of nose, of tongue, of body and of mind. Of the thirty-two kinds of contact, sixfold sense is the cause. Of the sixfold senses, the sixth sense (i.e. the mind) is the mainstay and in this sense it may be said conditioned by the sixth sense contact comes to pass.[5] Mrs. Rhys Davids[6] observes in this connection: '*Phassa* (contact) . . . is generalised to include all receptive experience, sensory as well as ideational, and to represent the essential antecedent and condition of all feeling . . . *phusati*, *phoṭṭhabbaṃ* (to touch, the tangible) are specialised to express the activity of one of the senses.' According to Keith, contact is the mediation between the senses and their objects,

[1] *Visuddhimagga* (P.T S), p 463
[2] *Atthasālinī*, p 137.
[3] *Ibid*, p 137.
[4] Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p 102.
[5] *Visuddhimagga*, p. 165.
[6] *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics*, p. lxiii.

and is of high importance in the theory of cognition; the fairest rendering is that it denotes the collision or co-operation of the attention aspect of consciousness directed to the organ in connection with an object; the scholastics interpret it as denoting the consciousness resulting from the contact, and not the contact itself. Feeling, as pleasant, painful, or neutral, is the outcome of contact, simultaneous to it in the canonical view, though later thought distinguishes the moments of contact, sensation production, and feeling. Though distinguished from cognition it must have a cognitive aspect, for contact is the application of consciousness to the knowledge of an object. The *Milinda-Pañho* therefore makes contemporaneous with feeling, perception, conceived intention, initial and sustained application and consciousness, while their intermixture is asserted in the canon itself.[1] In the chain of causation resulting in rebirth contact has a large part to play since it forms an important link in the formula of *Paticca-samuppāda* (dependent origination). The said formula has twelve links in the chain which runs as follows: By reason of ignorance, dispositions; by reason of dispositions, consciousness (*viññāna*); by reason of consciousness, name and form; by reason of name and form, contact; by reason of contact, feeling; by reason of feeling, thirst; by reason of thirst, grasping; by reason of grasping, becoming; by reason of becoming, birth; by reason of birth, old age, death, grief, mourning, pain, sorrow, and despair.[2]

S. Z. Aung [3] explains the concept of '*phassa*' in the following way: 'First of all, the subject is aware of the presence of an object . . . . . the object is either an agreeable sight, sound, smell, taste, touch or concrete mental object (*dhammā-rammaṇa*)—agreeable in the sense that it is desired by the subject (*iṭṭhārammaṇa*). This awareness of the objective presentation is termed contact (*phassa*).'

Vedanā: From *phassa* or contact, *vedanā* or feeling arises. *Vedanā* means sensation or feeling which is pleasurable or painful. *Saḷāyatana* means the six organs and objects of sense, viz., *rūpa*, *vedanā*, *saññā*, *saṅkhāra* and *viññāṇa*. In the *Vedanā Saṃyutta* of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* (IV, 204–238), we find that there are three *vedanās* or feeling—feeling that is pleasant, feeling that is painful and feeling that is neither pleasant nor painful. Lust for pleasant feeling, repugnance

---

[1] A. B Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, pp 102-103

[2] Cf *Dīgha Nikāya* (P T S), II, pp 32ff., 55ff, *Majjhima Nikāya* (P.T.S), I, pp. 49ff, 261, *Anguttara Nikāya* (P T S), I, p 177, *Nidāna S*, esp V, p. 388.

[3] *Compendium of Philosophy*, p. 14.

for unpleasant or painful feeling and ignorance of neutral feeling which is neither pleasant nor unpleasant generally arise in the mind.[1] Feeling is that which feels. It has (1) experiencing as characteristic, (2) enjoying as function, (3) taste of the mental properties as manifestation, and (4) tranquillity as proximate cause. 'If it be said that the function of enjoying the object is obtained only in pleasurable feeling, we reject that opinion, and say:—'Let it be pleasurable feeling or painful feeling or neutral feeling—all have the function of enjoying (*anubhavana*) the object.'[2] In the *Atthasālinī* feeling is likened to the king while the remaining associated states are like the cook. As the cook, when he has prepared food of diverse tastes, puts it in a basket, seals it, takes to the king, breaks the seal, opens the basket, takes the best of all the soup and curries, puts them in a dish, swallows to find out whether they are faulty or not, and afterward offers the food of various excellent tastes to the king. The king being lord, expert and master, eats whatever he likes. So the mere tasting of the food by the cook is like the partial enjoyment of the object by the remaining states. As the king, being lord, expert, and master, eats the meal according to his pleasure, so feeling, being lord, expert, and master, enjoys the taste of the object, and therefore it is said that enjoyment or experience is its function.[3]

In the ordinary usage the term *vedanā* commonly denotes a specific feeling, viz., the feeling of pain. The Buddhist conception, however, regards all kinds of suffering like birth, decay and death as few contingencies in human experience which upset the expectations of men. From the point of view of the mind *dukkha* is just a *vedanā* or feeling which is felt by the mind either in respect of the body or in respect of itself, and as a feeling, it is conditioned by certain circumstances in the absence of which there is no possibility of its occurrence.[4] According to Buddhaghosa, *Vedanākkhandha* means whatever has the characteristic of being felt. Though classified under three heads, *kusala, akusala* and *avyākata,* all feelings or *vedanā* are of the same nature on account of their being felt. According to its nature, *Vedanā* is of five kinds, e.g., *sukham, dukkhaṃ, somanassaṃ, domanassam* and *upekkhā*.[5] As there are six kinds of *phassa* or contact, so there are six kinds of *vedanā*, e.g., *cakkhusampassajā sotaghānajivhākāyamanosampassajāvedanā*. These six vedanās

[1] *Concepts of Buddhism*, pp 52-53.
[2] *Atthasālinī*, p 109. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.
[4] B C. Law, *Concepts of Buddhism*, p. 30.
[5] *Visuddhimagga*, Vol. II, p 461.

again are connected with eighty-nine *cittas* and hence they are said to be divided into eighty-nine. In eight different ways *phassa* produces *vedanā*. These ways may thus be enumerated, viz., (1) *sahajāta* (which comes into existence together with it), (2) *aññamañña* (mutual), (3) *nissaya* (support), (4) *vipāka* (consequence), (5) *āhāra* (nutriment), (6) *sampajutta* (connected), (7) *atthi* (existence), and (8) *avigata* (that which is not gone). Contact is followed by feeling and other psychical aggregates which come in succession. The *Milinda-Pañho* (p. 56) describes the chain with all its links. In the series after contact are given feeling, perception or idea, thought or will (*cetanā*), abstraction or concentration (*ekaggatā*), sense of vitality (*jīvitindriya*) and attention (*manasikāra*).[1]

As *phassa* is the cause of *vedanā*, so *vedanā* is the cause of *taṇhā* (desire).[2] The characteristics of feeling may be summed up in the words of S. Z. Aung: '*Vedanā* includes such emotions as joy and grief. It covers all kinds of feeling, physical and mental. Vedanā is either *kāyika* or *mānasika*. Under the aspect of feeling, *Vedanā* is either pleasure or pain or neither pain nor pleasure.'[3]

Saññā: The mind or *citta* is stirred to action by perception of an external object. *Saññā* or perception is therefore regarded as one of the five *khandhas* or constituent elements. According to Buddhaghosa, perception is the mere noting of objects such as blue, green, yellow, and so on, and it cannot reach the penetration into characteristics as impermanent, ill and selfless as we have pointed it out in case of *viññāṇa*. The noting of an object as blue, green, etc. is perception ('Perception', 'noting'-*saññā, sañjānanā*). It has the characteristic of noting and the function of recognising what has been previously noted. All perceptions have the characteristic of noting. Of them, that perception which knows by specialised knowledge, has the function of recognising what has been noted previously. We may see this procedure when the carpenter recognises a piece of wood which he has marked by specialised knowledge. Similarly we recognise a man by his sectarial mark on the forehead, by our specialised knowledge and say: 'He is so and so.' The same process is illustrated when the king's treasurer, in charge of the royal wardrobe, having had a label bound on each dress and being asked to bring a certain one, lights the lamp, enters the jewel chamber,

---

1 Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p 88.
2 *Visuddhimagga*, Vol II, p. 567.
3 *Compendium of Philosophy*, p. 14.

reads the label and brings the dress. According to another method, perception has the characteristic of noting by an act of general inclusion, and the function of assigning 'mark reasons' for this inclusive noting, as when wood-cutters perceive logs and so forth. Its manifestation is the inclining of the attention as in the case of blind persons who imagine an elephant by the particular characteristic of the part touched or according to another interpretation, who, though blind at present, can easily recollect the exact image of an elephant from past experience. In another sense, perception has briefness as manifestation, like lightning, owing to its inability to penetrate into the object.[1]

Saññā (perception) is the name of a real thing (*sabhāva*). *Sañjānanā* is the act of perceiving by noting. *Sañjānitattaṃ* shows the state of having perceived by noting.[2]

The subtle distinction between the three processes mentioned above is illustrated by a simile. Because it seizes just the appearance of an object as blue, green and so forth, perception is like the seeing of the coins by the undiscerning child. Because it seizes the appearance of the object as blue, green, and so forth, and also leads to penetration of the characteristics, consciousness is like the seeing of the coins by the peasant. Because it seizes the appearance of the object as blue, green, and so forth, leads to the penetration of the characteristics, and also leads to the manifestation of the path, understanding is like the seeing of the coins by the banker. The three processes, however, are so closely interrelated that in practice it is not possible to distinguish one from the other by saying: 'This is perception, this is consciousness and this is understanding.'[3] All things which have the characteristic of perceiving are to be known as the aggregates of perception. From its intrinsic nature of the characteristic of perceiving, it is single. As moral, immoral, indeterminate, it is of three kinds. Verily there is no consciousness which is dissociated from perception. Therefore the divisions of perception are as many as those of consciousness.

In all cases of perception there must be an awareness of the mind. Sometimes perception takes place but it cannot properly function. We have then a case of neither perception nor non-perception. Thus a novice going on a journey ahead of his Elder, saw a little water and said, 'Water, Sir; take off your shoes'. Then when the Elder said, 'If so, bring the

[1] *Atthasālinī* (P.T S.), p. 110.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 140.
[3] *Visuddhimagga*, pp. 436ff

athing cloth; we will bathe'. At this he replied, 'There is no water'. In this simile, as there is water in the sense of being just enough to wet the shoes, and no water in the sense of being enough for bathing, so this perception from its incapacity for effective function is not perception, and from the presence of the subtle residuum of mental co-efficients is not non-perception. All perception has the function of giving hint as to the cause of recognition saying, 'That is the very same thing'. It has the manifestation of producing the mental image or impression by virtue of the hint taken, as a blind man, forming an idea of the elephant from the particular part of its body which he happens to touch, sees it in his mind's eye. It has the object conceived in the mind as the proximate cause.[1] According to Mrs. Rhys Davids [2] *Saññā* is not limited to sense-perception, but includes perception of all kinds. She further draws a line of distinction between *saññā* as cognitive assimilation during sense-perception and *saññā* as cognitive assimilation of ideas by way of naming. The former is called perception of resistance of opposition (*paṭighasaññā*). According to Buddhaghosa, this is perception on occasion of sight, hearing, etc., when consciousness is aware of the impact of impressions, of external things as different, we might say. The latter is called perception of the equivalent word, or name (*adhivacanasaññā*) and is exercised by the *sensus communis* (*mano*).

'In the realm of thought', says Keith, 'Buddhaghosa has an interesting doctrine of the relations of perception (*saññā*), intelligence (*viññāṇa*), and intuition (*paññā*). He compares them [3] to the different reactions provoked by the sight of precious metals in a child, which sees in them coloured objects; in a citizen who recognises in them utilities with exchange value; and in an expert who can tell their origin and fashioner. On the topic of zest or interest (*pīti*) he has much to say,[4] and he illustrates the superhuman powers which are possessed by a person in such a state.[5]

The *Saññākkhandha* consists of six kinds of perception. When an object is seen, whether it be green or red, there is the perception that it is of that particular colour. So also when any sound is heard, whether it be from the drum or any other instrument, there is the perception that it is such a sound; when there is any smell, whether it be agreeable or disagreeable, there is the perception that it is such a smell.

---

1 *Visuddhimagga* (P.T.S.), p. 462.
2 *Buddhist Psychology*, pp. 49-50
3 *Majjhima Nikaya*, I, p 292.
4 *Atthasālinī* (P.T.S.), p. 115.
5 Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 196.

Similarly we may have perception of tongue, of body and of mind.[1] Aung[2] says that *saññā*, in Buddhist psychology, means the awareness of the marks, real or imaginary, by which an object either of sense or thought is or may hereafter be recognised.

Khandha: The meaning of *Khandha* (aggregate) should be taken as group or mass, etc. 'It goes by the name of a large *Khandha* of water'—here *khandha* is used in the sense of mass. 'The *khandha* of virtue, or of concentration'—here it is used in the sense of good quality.[3] The Blessed One saw a large piece of wood[4]—here it is used as mere designation. It is called aggregate in the phrase: *viññāṇa-khandha* symbolically as one unit of consciousness is a part of consciousness.[5] Keith[6] points out that by a division which seems to have no precedent in Brahmanical texts, and which has certainly no merit, logical or psychological, the individual is divided into five aggregates or groups (*khandha*), the Sanskrit equivalent of which means 'body' in the phrase *Dharmaskandha* in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. The first is *Rūpa*, which denotes simply matter, or material quality, and covers the elements and their compounds; the term aggregate has obviously considerable appropriateness as applied to the complex admixture which makes up the human body, and it is clearly absurd to infer from it any conception of constant dynamic conditions in the body, which indeed, is treated by the Canon as relatively stable and long-lived. Of the four psychical aggregates the first in the stereotyped order is feeling (*vedanā*) then comes perception (*saññā*), then the aggregate of dispositions (*saṅkhāra*), and knowledge or intellect (*viññāṇa*) is the last of these aggregates.[7]

The aggregation of the five *khandhas* constitutes the *pudgala* (*puggala*). The five khandhas are: (1) *Rūpakkhandha*, (2) *Vedanākkhandha*, (3) *Saññākkhandha*, (4) *Saṅkhārakkhandha*, and (5) *Viññāṇakkhandha*. Of these *Rūpakkhandha* is of five kinds. It has two broad divisions, viz., *Bhūtarūpa* and *Upādārūpa*. *Bhūtarūpa* or phenomenal matter includes *Paṭhavidhātu*, *Āpodhātu*, *Tejodhātu*, and *Vāyodhātu* (i.e. earth, water, fire, and air). *Upādārūpa* (secondary forms or matters derived from primary elements) includes—*cakkhu*, *sota*, *ghāna*, *jivhā*, *kāya*, *rūpa*, *sadda*, *gandha*, *rasa*, *itthindriya*,

---

[1] Spence Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p 419

[2] *Compendium of Philosophy*, pp. 15-16.

[3] *Anguttara N.*, I, p. 125.

[4] *Samyutta Nikaya*, IV, p. 179.

[5] *Atthasālinī* (P.T S.), p. 141

[6] *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 85

[7] *Buddhist Philosophy*, pp. 85 foll.

jīvitindriya, hadayavatthu, kāyaviññatti, vaciviññatti, ākāsadhātu and so on.[1]

Kamma: Kamma has been defined as volition (*cetanā 'ham, bhikkhave, kammaṃ vadāmi*).[2] It is in this line that Buddhaghosa also defines *kamma*. From this it is clear that an action is no action until the will is manifested in conduct. *Kamma* means consciousness of good and bad, merit and demerit (*kammaṃ nāma kusalākusala-cetanā*).[3] Broadly speaking, we have three classes of action (*kamma*) according to the three doors of action. Thus we have bodily action, vocal action and mental action. Having willed, one acts by body, speech and thought.[4] Volition is thus a state of *kamma*. States associated with volition are also *kammas*. This is clear from the fourfold classification of *kamma*. Thus we have: (1) *kamma* which is impure and productive of impurity, (2) *kamma* which is pure and productive of purity, (3) *kamma* which is both impure and pure, and productive of both impurity and purity, and lastly (4) *kamma* which is neither impure nor pure, and is productive of neither impurity nor purity, and which, though itself *kamma*, leads to the destruction of *kammas*. Thus the seven factors of wisdom like mindfulness and others, may be said to be *kamma*, which being neither impure nor pure, productive of neither impurity nor purity, lead to the destruction of *kamma*.[5] In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* the Buddha is represented as saying: 'I declare monks, that there can be no annulment of voluntary (*sañcetanikā*) deeds . . . without experience of the results thereof.' (Aṅguttara, V, 292ff). The Master is further said to have repeated 'I declare, monks, volition to be action'.[6] Here, of course, volition as moral action without qualification was meant by the Master. Volition which is morally indeterminate is without moral result.[7]

There are four classes of *Kamma* or action, namely, (1) action which produces result in this life (*diṭṭhadhamma-vedaniyaṃ*), (2) work which produces results in the next life (*upapaccavedaniyaṃ*), (3) deeds which produce result from time to time[8] (*aparāpariyāyavedaniyaṃ*), and (4) past action or *ahosi kamma*. Kamma is also divided into four classes on other grounds, viz., (1) *Garuka*, i.e. an act, whether good or

[1] Warren's *Table of Contents of the Visuddhimagga* (*J P T.S*, 1891–93), pp. 124-5

[2] *Atthasālini*, pp. 88ff.

[3] *Visuddhimagga*, Vol II, p. 614.

[4] *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, P T.S., III, p. 415.

[5] *Atthasālini*, pp. 88ff.

[6] *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, III, p. 415.

[7] B. C. Law, *The Debates Commentary*, p. 167.

[8] *Visuddhimagga*, Vol. II, p. 601.

bad, producing a serious result, (2) *Bahula*, i.e. excess of virtue or vice with the requisite consequence, (3) *Āsanna*, i.e. karma which is taken into account at the time of death, and (4) *kaṭattākamma*, i.e. an act done frequently or oft repeated during one's life-time, which in the absence of other classes of actions mentioned above may alone cause his rebirth. Viewed from a different standpoint we may have another fourfold division of *kamma* as (1) *janaka* or reproductive action, (2) *Upatthambhako* or maintaining action, (3) *Upapīḷaka* or unfavourable action, and (4) *Upaghātaka* or destructive action. In fact the doctrine of *kamma* is the fundamental and basic principle of Buddhism. Action produces consequence, retribution follows from action which brings rebirth in its chain and in this way the world goes on. All the factors of this diversified sentient organism, such as *kamma*, feature (*liṅga*), idea, language, etc. in the destinies of spirits, men, denizens of purgatories, lower animals, etc., are accomplished by the mind. Hence there is a variety of *kammas*; and owing to this variety, there is in the various destinies difference of features, i.e., difference in hands, feet, ears, stomachs, necks, faces, etc. The difference in notion or idea is because of the difference in outward form, expressed by 'this is woman, this is, man', according to the form taken. Good and bad in various deeds are accomplished by the mind. Depending on the difference in *kamma* appears the difference in the births of beings, high and low, exalted and base, happy and miserable. Depending on the difference in kamma appears the difference in the individual features of beings as beautiful or ugly, high-born or low-born, well-built or deformed. Depending on the difference in *kamma* appears the difference in the worldly conditions of beings as gain and loss, fame and disgrace, blame and praise, happiness and misery. By *kamma* the world moves, by *kamma* men live, and by *kamma* all beings are bound up.[1] By *kamma* one attains glory and praise and by *kamma* come bondage, ruin and tyranny. Thus *kamma* bears fruit in manifold forms. 'O lad', so runs the *Majjhima Nikāya* (III, 203), 'beings have *kamma* as their property, they are its heirs, are originated by it, are its kin, are sheltered by it. *Kamma* divides beings into low and exalted'.[2]

There is no originator of *kamma*, no sufferer of consequences; only phenomena continue (*kammassa kārako natthi* . . . *Visuddhimagga*, II, p. 602). *Kamma* has its own individuality, its own inheritor. One will have to share the

[1] *Sutta-Nipāta*, v 654.
[2] *Atthasālini*, p. 66; *The Expositor*, I, p. 88.

fruits of his *kamma*, be they good or bad.[1] No action passes from the past life to the present nor from the present to the future.[2] As to the relation between *kamma* and *vipāka*, Buddhaghosa says that there is no *kamma* in *vipāka* and no *vipāka* in *kamma*. Each of them by itself is void. Nevertheless, there is no *vipāka* without *kamma*. Just as there is no fire in the sun nor in the lens nor in the (dried) cow-dung and likewise, fire is not outside them but comes into existence on account of these requisites, in the same way *vipāka* is not seen within the *kamma* nor is it outside the *kamma*. A *kamma* is void of its *vipāka* which comes through *kamma*.[3] In the past, the *khandhas*, which originated as the consequences of action (volition) ceased. In this existence, other *khandhas* arise out of the consequences of past deeds. There is no condition which has come to this existence from the past. In this existence the *khandhas* which originate as the result of *kamma*, are destroyed. In another existence, others will be produced from this existence, not a single condition will follow rebirth.[4] In the interpretation of passages such as, 'He, by the doing, the accumulating, the augmenting, the abundance of that action is gifted with the voice of a Brahmadeva';[5] some hold that sound is a result of action. Others hold that 'result of action' is a term applying to mental states only which have been transmitted by action, but does not apply to material things. In the same way Buddhaghosa points out that some hold that the six sense-spheres have arisen through the doing of past actions, and therefore they are results. Others hold, on the contrary, that the mind-sphere (*manāyatanaṃ*) may be such a result, but the rest are only transmitted by action and are not results.[6] According to the *Atthasālinī*, *kamma* is of three kinds, *kāyakamma* (bodily action), *vacikamma* (action due to speech), and *manokamma* (actions springing from mind). It is *cetanā* and the states associated with it.[7] Childers[8] observes that all three originate in *cetanā* or the will. *Kamma* under the name of *sankhāra* is one of the links of *Paṭiccasamuppāda*.[9]

The *Mahānidāna sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* points out that there is descent of consciousness into the womb of the mother preparatory to rebirth.[10] According to Keith a consistent body of evidence proves that even in the early

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, II, p. 601.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 603.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 603.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 603.
[5] *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, pp. 144, 173.
[6] *The Debates Commentary*, p. 168.
[7] *Atthasālinī*, p. 88.
[8] *Pāli Dictionary*, p. 176.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 178.
[10] *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, p. 63.

school there was a recognition of the necessity of finding some means of continuity if the doctrine of the act were not to fall into disrepute, and if remembrance of former births were to be possible. In support of this he quotes the *Milinda-Pañho* (pp. 40ff.), a text of unblemished orthodoxy, in which the question of continuity and moral responsibility is energetically put.[1]

Buddhaghosa divides *kamma* into—(1) *kammasamuṭṭhāna* (set up by *karma*), (2) *kammapaccaya* (caused by *karma*), (3) *kammapaccayacittasamuṭṭhāna* (caused by *karma* and set up by consciousness), and (5) *kammapaccaya-utusamuṭṭhānaṃ* (caused by *karma* and set up by temperature). *Kamma* is ultimately reduced to the psychological factor of volition. Volition is the unique determination of will. Will exercise has its power over its co-existent mental properties and physical qualities. In fact all our activities in deed, word or thought are due to its influence. The doctrine of *karma* or the efficacy of good or bad works is inseparably bound up with that of renewed existence. The world exists through *karma* and people live through *karma* (*kammanā vattati loko, kammanā vattati pajā*).[2] It is stated in the *Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā* that there is a relation between *citta* and *kamma*. If mind be distracted no *kamma* can be performed. Old karma is destroyed and no new karma is produced. (*khīnaṃ purāṇaṃ navaṃ n'atthi sambhavaṃ*).

Puggala: As the result of his action a person's individuality is formed which gives one a distinctive mark among the rest of humanity. The aggregation of the five *khandhas* constitute the *pudgala* or *puggala*. Individuality means body, the five aggregates. This is the usual or common way of speaking of individuals.[3] According to the Buddhists the individual has no real existence. Although the doctrine which denies a self is certainly orthodox, it is certain that other Buddhists are perfectly contented with the conception of a true person (*pudgala*) which for all practical purposes may be regarded as an effective self.[4] The individual is only a *sammuti*. Buddhaghosa also says that on the existence of *khandhas* such as *rūpa*, etc. there is the usage '*evaṃnāma*', '*evaṃgotta*'. Because of this usage, common consent and name, there is the *Puggala*.[5] *Puggala*, *attā*, *satta* and *jīva* are the four terms which occur in the Buddhist texts in

---

[1] *Buddhist Philosophy*, pp 78–81.
[2] B. C Law, *Concepts of Buddhism*, p. 59.
[3] *Visuddhimagga* (P T S), p. 310.
[4] Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 81.
[5] *Kathāvatthuppakarana-aṭṭhakathā*, *J.P.T S.*, 1889, pp. 32–35.

connection with all discussions relating to individual, individuality, personality, self and soul. As a biological term, *puggala* is nowhere used to deny the existence of an individual being or a living person. When it is said, e.g. in the *Dhammapada* that the self is the lord of the self (*attā hi attano nātho*) or in the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta*, 'Be yourself your own lamp and your own refuge' (*atta-dīpā viharatha attasaraṇā*), by the word *atta* or 'self' is meant the living individual to whom the advice is given. The self is declared to be the lord of the self, the witness of its good and evil, in the *Dhammapada*. Again the Buddha declares there are four kinds of persons, he who applies himself to the good of another not of the self, etc.[1] It is clearly no adequate answer to argue as Keith shows that in such expressions the self is nothing but the thought (*citta*), for that is merely a question of phraseology. Hence he concludes: 'What we recognise in such expressions is the fact that there is a dominant element in the individual, the object of taming, and we find in the *Milinda-Pañho* (p. 62) the analogous conception in the intellectual sphere'.[2] The Buddha refused to answer the questions: 'Is the *Jīva* the same as the body? Is the *Jīva* different from the body?' In its original sense the questions refer to the issue of the identity of the vital principle (*jīvitindriya*) and the body. But the arguments of the personalists treat it as applying to the person (*pudgala*) and the five aggregates. Hence we have the doctrine the doer of the deed is neither the same as, nor different from the sufferer of the penalty. Similarly the person is neither identical with the aggregates, nor yet is he distinct from them; the relationship is properly described as ineffable (*avācya*), a position which forms the subject of attack by the Madhyamaka as well as by Vasubandhu.[3] Its merits, however, are obvious. It mediates, in the best Buddhist manner, between phenomena with a basis and the permanent unchanging self of the Brahmanic tradition.[4] The person (*pudgala*) is a *sammutisacca*, truth by general consent but really erroneous.[5] As Buddhaghosa puts it the chain of causation serves to negative the existence of any permanent self, the passive recipient of pleasure and of pain; the process is possible without the idea of a self, even if it does not absolutely exclude such an underlying reality.[6]

---

[1] *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, II, 95, *Puggalapaññatti*, 54, *Kathāvatthu Commentary*, 8

[2] *Buddhist Philosophy*, 82.

[3] *Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti on Mūlamadhyamakakārikās*, ed. Poussin, *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, p 283.

[4] *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 83. [5] *Ibid.*, p 222 f n. 2. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

The term '*puggala*', as applied to an individual, is an abstraction and presents a few problems. Now an individual being or a thing is always represented by a name which in itself is void of any meaning unless used with reference to that individual. An individual is nothing but a combination of the five constituent elements or the four primaries and matters derived therefrom. But there never arises a position in thought where the equation of the whole with the sum total of the parts is justified, nor can at the same time the notion of the whole be possible apart from the parts. The point may well be illustrated by the simile of a chariot and its parts.[1] As to a living human being, who too is not a permanent object in nature or in experience, the concepts or general ideas that may be formed in thought with reference to him are the five aggregates. The individuals come and go but the concepts as concepts remain as permanent materials of thought and as the possible modes of representation in thought or means of description in words. The Buddhist view of '*puggala*', as set forth above, is found in the *Milinda-Pañho*. The *Puggalakathā* in the *Kathāvatthu* is also interesting. In a nut-shell the viewpoint set forth here may be stated as follows. To talk about the five aggregates as *vijjamāna paññattis* is to return no answer to the problem of individuality. If five aggregates be real as concepts or means of representation, they convey no meaning without reference to individuals in existence. Without such a reference the aggregates posited as reals, are mere abstractions. The problem of individuality is bound up with the problem of ego or soul. With the Buddhist, rebirth is to be conceived as *kammasantati* or the continuity of an impulse.[2]

Sīla: All the authorities on Buddhism without exception assign a very high and important place to '*sīla*' which, according to them, is the foundation of all good qualities. *Sīla* means 'habit' or 'good conduct'. According to the *Dīgha Nikāya* wisdom (*paññā*) and conduct (*sīla*) are necessary for constituting a true Brahmin.[3] Now conduct or external behaviour is only an outward expression of the moral states (*cetasikā dhammā*) which constitute man's internal character. The moral character must grow, if it is to grow at all, of itself, from within. So the three factors in the Buddhist path, namely, *sīla-visuddhi* or purity of conduct, *citta-visuddhi*

[1] *Puggala Paññatti Commentary*, pp. 171ff.—*Vijjamānapaññattis.*
[2] Law, *Concepts of Buddhism*, p. 46.
[3] *Sonadanda Sutta, Dīgha*, I, pp. 111–126.

or purity of mind and *ñāṇa-visuddhi* or purity of knowledge are of no avail unless they lead to '*vimutti*' or emancipation.[1]

Conduct admits of two broad divisions as positive and negative. In the *Atthasālinī*,[2] we find the same classification of virtue, viz.: (1) *cārittasīla*, i.e. positive virtue as opposed to (2) *vārittasīla* or negative morality. 'This ought to be practised' is a positive rule of conduct. 'This ought not to be practised' is a negative rule of conduct. The Exalted One thus exhorted his followers to follow certain principles of conduct and asked them to abstain from others.[3] Conduct, again is of six kinds, e.g., conduct of lust, of hate, of delusion, of faith, of intelligence and of applied thought. By way of mixing and grouping four others are also made out of lust and an equal number out of faith. Together with these eight we may have fourteen types of conduct.[4] For all practical purposes the six broad divisions of conduct are generally recognised. In the refinement and sublimation of immoral conduct, in its eventual uplift to moral and spiritual level, lies the well-being of man which is the essence of *sīla-visuddhi*. The term '*sīla*' is thus used in the sense of 'right conduct'. According to the quotation cited by Buddhaghosa from the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, it is divided into four parts, *cetanā sīlaṃ*, *cetasika sīlaṃ*, *saṃvara sīlam* and *avitikkamo sīlaṃ*. The thought of a person who abstains from killing, etc. is called *cetanā sīla*. *Saṃvara sīlaṃ* is of five kinds, viz. *Pātimokkha-samvara*, *Satisamvara*, *Ñāṇasamvara*, *Khantisamvara* and *Viriyasamvara*. Sīla is again thought of as being threefold according to the varying degree of its efficacy as (1) *hīna* or inferior, (2) *majjhima* or mediocre, and (3) *paṇīta* or superior, and there are sub-divisions of these three. Sīla is described as that which pacifies the mind. Its function is to destroy evil deeds and secure the purity of body, mind and speech. But all such purity is never regarded as the final goal or as an end in itself unless they lead to the desired bliss. In the *Visuddhimagga* (I, pp. 6–58) we find quotations cited by Buddhaghosa from various authorities recommending strict observance of the precepts (*sīla*) and enumerating the evil effects resulting from violation thereof. The duties of performance and avoidance, the dual or twofold aspects of *sīla* constitute the practical code of morality. Abstention from taking life, from false, abortive or idle speech, from theft and use of intoxicants—are the prohibitive injunctions while sexual

[1] *Concepts of Buddhism*, pp. 35-36.
[2] *The Expositor*, I, p. 102 n., *Atthasālinī*, p. 77, *Visuddhimagga*, p. 10
[3] *Visuddhimagga* (P.T.S.), p. 11.
[4] *Visuddhimagga*, pp. 101-102.

purity forms a positive rule of conduct. The end of man, as Keith points out,[1] is to free himself, if possible, in this life from the intoxicants, the lust of being born again in this world, or in the world of subtle matter, or the world without matter, and the ignorance of the four noble truths. His aim is to break the chain of causation, and to free himself from desire or appetite, aversion and dullness. There can be no extinction of desire if ignorance prevails and therefore the extinction of ignorance is necessary. The doctrine that conduct (*sīla*), concentration (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññā*), are all essential; that concentration pervaded by conduct is fruitful; that wisdom pervaded by concentration is fruitful; and that the self, pervaded by wisdom is freed from the corruption of desire, false views, and ignorance. Concentration, however, is attainable only through the observance of *sīla* or conduct. A Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya[2] mentions conduct and wisdom as an essential pair.

Buddhist philosophy might have owed its origin from the wise utterances of Lord Buddha and a group of exponents and thinkers who followed him. Nevertheless, it is in a sense a product of Buddhaghosa because he gave it a perfect and final shape through his own comments and interpretations. Some hold the view that the religion of Śākyamuni, as it is in vogue in Ceylon today, is virtually a creed as interpreted by Buddhaghosa. The notes and explanations that are found in the sacred texts, literary and philosophical, are due to Buddhaghosa and his school. The *Tripiṭaka* is replete no doubt with the philosophical ideas with which he deals in his commentaries. Nevertheless, in his works we find them in a systematic form. It is not improbable that he based his conclusions on the opinions of past generations of exponents whose thoughts were embodied in the earlier *Aṭṭhakathās* which he consulted. It is difficult to discern how much of his own he was able to add to the old stock of ideas. Yet the fact remains that many of these philosophical notions and concepts would remain unintelligible to us but for his explanations and interpretative comments. His comments are sometimes verbose and at points they contain needless jargons and repetitions. No one can, however, deny that behind all this tautology and other drawbacks from which his exegetical comments suffer, there was the desire to make philosophical matters clear and to explain all that seemed to him abstract and vague.

---

[1] *Buddhist Philosophy*, pp. 115ff.
[2] *Dīgha*, 1, 124.

INDEX

Published by the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, Town Hall, Bombay, and Printed by Norman A Ellis, Baptist Mission Press, 41A Lower Circular Road, Calcutta